ABRAHAMS, ISRAEL. Glory of God. 88p $1.25
1 Oxford [3s 6d Milford]
231 God
"Three homiletic lectures upon the phrase 'the glory of God' delivered by the Reader in Talmudic in the University of Cambridge, England. They are enriched with a wealth of citations from rabbinical literature and a generous use of the best said upon this theme by Christian scholars."—J Religion
Book review digest 1926
NOV 21 1927

The GLORY OF GOD

Three Lectures

By I. ABRAHAMS, M.A.

Three sections: I. Natural, II. Messianic, III. Pragmatic.

'I confess that my own deepest interest in the conception of the Glory of God lies in its pragmatic application to life. For this reason I have not restricted myself to the Jewish aspects of the case. These, however, were my main concern, for the Christian allusions are merely occasional and illustrative, needing far more elaboration than I was competent to give. It was a pleasure, however, to recognize how much of good there is common between Church and Synagogue, on a theme which probes deep into the heart of fundamental spiritual concepts, and deep also into the noblest ideals of human conduct.'—*From the Preface.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen
New York Toronto Melbourne Cape Town
Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai
Humphrey Milford

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/gloryofgodthreel0000iabr

The
GLORY OF GOD

Published under the auspices of the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, with a subvention from the Alexander Kohut Memorial Fund

(The) GLORY OF GOD

Three Lectures

by

I. ABRAHAMS, M.A.

Reader in Talmudic, University of Cambridge
Visiting Lecturer, Jewish Institute of Religion
New York

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
No longer property of the
Dayton Public Library
BM
610
.A3
1925
4/610

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
HUMPHREY MILFORD
1925

THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Printed in England

THE ALEXANDER KOHUT MEMORIAL FOUNDATIONS

In memory of Dr. Alexander Kohut, alike distinguished as Rabbi, Orator, and Orientalist (April 22, 1842–May 25, 1894) and widely known through his encyclopedic Talmudic Dictionary, the Aruch Completum *(Vienna 1878–New York 1892: 8 Volumes and Supplement; new edition 5 volumes incomplete, Wilna 1910–1913), his family, through the initiative of his eldest son, George Alexander Kohut, has established a series of Literary Foundations, bearing his name, for the purpose of fostering Semitic and Oriental research in Europe and America.*

The first of these Foundations was established in 1915, at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, and is designated 'THE ALEXANDER KOHUT MEMORIAL PUBLICATION FUND'. *Under its auspices the Yale University Press has already issued (1915–1924) four notable works comprising Texts and Researches, edited by members of the Faculty in the Semitic Department, and other volumes are to follow at regular intervals.*

There is also an 'ALEXANDER KOHUT RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP IN SEMITICS' *annually awarded at Yale, made possible by a special gift in 1919, for the purpose of stimulating post-graduate study.* It is the first

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NOV 21 1957
Hoy
175172+
Mac

instance on record of a Jewish Scholar thus commemorated at one of the leading Universities in America. *Yale also has the bulk of the library of Dr. Kohut, set apart as a separate unit and known as the* 'ALEXANDER KOHUT MEMORIAL COLLECTION', *with a specially designed bookplate in each volume.*

In 1922 and 1923 similar 'KOHUT FOUNDATIONS' *were established successively in Vienna, Berlin, and New York, at the last-named place through the initiative of Dr. Stephen S. Wise, the distinguished Founder of the Free Synagogue and of the* JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION—*a seat of higher learning for the training of men for the Rabbinate, for Jewish scientific research and leadership in Jewish affairs.*

As the firstfruit of the Viennese 'KOHUT FOUNDATION' *there appeared Dr. V. Aptowitzer's monograph on* Cain and Abel in the Hagada *and now the life-work of that noted scholar, Dr. Immanuel Loew, on the* Flora of the Jews (*three volumes, 1923–1925*). *The forthcoming publications of the* KOHUT FOUNDATIONS *in Berlin and New York will, it is confidently expected, attain an equally high standard of literary and scientific excellence. Several volumes of exceptional merit are now ready for the press and will probably appear within the current year.*

INSCRIBED TO

STEPHEN S. WISE

ON HIS COMPLETING

FIFTY YEARS

OF A LIFE

SPENT IN THE SERVICE WHICH IS

THE TRUEST GLORIFICATION OF GOD

PREFACE

These Lectures on the Glory of God were delivered, substantially as here printed, in the United States of America during the Spring of 1924. At the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, the course was delivered during the week beginning 5 May. The course was spread over five meetings. A similar series was also delivered at the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, where I received a welcome for which I am deeply grateful.

The President of the J. I. R., Dr. Stephen S. Wise, urged me to prepare the Lectures for publication, and to him I dedicate them as a slight mark of my affection. From first to last, my visits to America were made on his direct initiative. I have grown to esteem him more the more our intimacy has developed, and I am happy to associate these Lectures with his name. I have not introduced any serious changes into the spoken Lectures. Unlike the earlier course on 'Permanent Values in Judaism', this series was written in Cambridge before my sailing to America. Nevertheless, the composition was hurried, and there was insufficient

time and leisure, as there would in any case have been insufficient capacity, to render the addresses worthy of their subject.

I confess that my own deepest interest in the conception of the Glory of God lies in its pragmatic application to life. For this reason I have not restricted myself to the Jewish aspects of the case. These, however, were my main concern, for the Christian allusions are merely occasional and illustrative, needing far more elaboration than I was competent to give. It was a pleasure, however, to recognize how much of good there is common between Church and Synagogue, on a theme which probes deep into the heart of fundamental spiritual concepts, and deep also into the noblest ideals of human conduct.

CONTENTS

THE GLORY OF GOD

	PAGE
I. Natural	11
II. Messianic	39
III. Pragmatic	62

I

NATURAL

In No. 49 of the *Tatler* Richard Steele used of Lady Elizabeth Hastings the famous words: 'to love her is a liberal education.' Swinburne described the phrase as 'the most exquisite tribute ever paid to a noble woman'. In much the same way, Augustine Birrell thinks it 'the most magnificent compliment ever paid by man to woman'. Exquisite the tribute undoubtedly is, magnificent the compliment. But the most exquisite, the most magnificent? I wonder. Perhaps it may be matched from the Talmud (Qiddushin 31*b*). When Rabbi Joseph heard the nearing footsteps of his mother, he stood up and said: 'I will arise before the Glory of God (Shekinah) which approaches.' At least as fine a tribute, this, as Steele's. Not that we need measure such homages of men to women, or weigh them, against each other. Each is splendid of its own kind.

Trailing her cloud of glory the mother came. Rabbi Joseph must have detected a divine charm in her and a radiant serenity—above all serenity. For, Glory–Peace is the true correspondence, Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace. Luke (ii. 14) had the genuine touch. So, as Delitzsch remarks, had the author of Psalm xxix. In God's heavenly Temple every whit of it uttereth Glory, and on earth God's people is blessed with peace. Do the centuries come and go, and does the *Gloria in excelsis* remain without its counterpart of *pax in terris*?

Men will not for ever transmute halo into laurel, nor walk on paths of glory leading but to the grave.

In this range of ideas, however, we have arrived nearly at the end of our quest. Nearly, not quite. The end is not the seeing by all men together of the Glory manifest, but the common action of all men in producing and materializing the vision. Glory–Peace is a human as well as a divine equivalence. The divine aspect is in a sense final, but the human validates the final, and thus is, in another sense, more final of the two. From the end we must retrace our steps. Again, not to the beginning, for the beginnings are veiled. But we can get nearer to the beginning.

A stage, nearer the beginning, is illustrated by two or three recent incidents. In September 1923 Signor Mussolini, refusing to refer his dispute with Greece to the League of Nations, proclaimed that ' nothing would make him recoil, or accept a compromise with national honour '. Two months later, Serbia played the same role against Bulgaria—the national honour must be preserved. Later still, in February 1924, Zaghlul, then Nationalist Premier of Cairo, found himself impelled ' to safeguard Egyptian dignity ' by interrupting the explorations of the Valley of the Kings. The United States, in its later treatment of Japan, like England in its earlier treatment of the Boers, has not been free from a similar proclamation of policy. ' We never blushed before ', perorated Lord Cairns in March 1881, when England was inclined to ignore President Kruger's insults. And so Greeks fired their submissive salutes to Italy, Bulgars lowered their flag to Jugo-Slovakia, Mr. Carter was temporarily dismissed, Japan humiliated, and the Transvaal invaded—and national honours were redeemed.

Now, as we trace the history of our theme, we find in the Bible marks of the assignment to God of the same range of feelings. Later on the Rabbis repudiated such assignment. God, said they (commenting on Micah vi. 8), does not thus stand on his dignity. ' Though thou insult me publicly,' says God, ' come to me in privacy, I and thou alone together, and I will forget and forgive.' But there are Biblical passages displaying an attitude more akin to Mussolini's. Especially is this so in Ezekiel, the prophet *par excellence* of the Divine Glory, the poet whose Chariot imagery (derived from Babylonia) coloured even the glory manifestations of the Pentateuch, and left its impress on the Gospels and the Apocalypse. How does Ezekiel represent the Judgement of God on the nations ? Not as a means of reconciling them to himself, but, in the phrase of an accomplished critic, God judges ' that he may have the empty satisfaction of their acknowledgement, in the midst and by means of desolation and carnage, that he is indeed a very mighty God.' The same thought lowers the record of the pains and penalties administered to Pharaoh—God's glory needed the king's extorted admission of the divine power. Yet there is something besides, which saves this distorted loyalty from utter contempt, nay even compels our high admiration. In the mind of every ancient Hebrew writer the world exists for God's glory, and (to cite C. G. Montefiore's words again) ' the goal of history is not reached till all men recognize it '. The catastrophe of Israel's exile in particular was not due to God's impotence, but to Israel's sin. God's honour—his requital of wrong, his fidelity to covenants, his demand for recognition—was thus synonymous with the divine ordering of history.

But again we have made a false start. We must revert to something else—at once more primitive and more permanent—in the Hebrew concept of the Glory of the Lord. It is more primitive—for we touch origins ; it is more permanent—for we reach results. Now, no other sensation is at once so ancient and so modern as the sensation of awe during a storm. Our generation no longer reads Humboldt's *Cosmos*, but those of us who enjoyed it in our now distant youth feel the rapture still. Humboldt, by the way, was a familiar member of the distinguished circle which centred round the Mendelssohn family in Berlin in the first half of the nineteenth century. He actually quotes Moses Mendelssohn's Psalter, which ' excellent version ' he follows. Like Heine, Humboldt admired the ' noble echoes of the ancient Hebrew poetry ' caught in the writings of Spanish Jews who figure in Michael Sachs' *Religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien* (1845). Sachs effected two fine ends when he inspired Heine entirely to his Jehuda ben Halevi, and Humboldt partly to his *Cosmos*. The latter recognizes that the feeling for nature, or rather the portraiture of natural phenomena, is more developed in Hebrew and Indian than in Greek or Roman poetry. In such phenomena, the Hebrew genius in particular saw an image of infinity, a massive manifestation of God. The storm is nowhere else described in ancient poetry as it is in Hebrew. ' Before he is a substance the Sun is a god ', writes George Santayana, discussing ' the discovery of natural objects ' by the primitive mind. It may be that in its phraseology even the nineteenth Psalm retains traces of having been, in inception, a hymn to Shemesh. But these appreciations of natural phenomena do not cease to influence the sophisticated as they did

the primitive mind. Particularly, I repeat, is this true of the storm.

I recall how, during a determined aeroplane raid on London, hostile bombs and defensive anti-aircraft guns were noisily disturbing the night—when suddenly the skies opened to the natural lightnings, and the thunders pealed out their tremendous notes of glory. How puny seemed man's fiercest efforts in presence of this artillery of heaven. Guns and bombs were silenced; a solemn hush ensued as the Lord waked up out of his holy habitation, coming with cloud and thunder to rebuke his quarrelsome children. I speak, saith the Lord; do ye hold your peace! And as we all stood at reverent attention, with a certain expectancy before this revelation of majestic power, more than one of us must have laughed at the shallowness of Pope's facile *Essay on Man*, with its attribution of such emotions exclusively to savages.

> Lo, the poor Indian, whose untutored mind
> Sees God in clouds, or hears him in the wind—

Our minds, we fondly conceive, are more tutored, and so were the minds of the authors of the Mishnah (Berakoth ix. 2). And these bid us, and we obey, at the sight of such natural phenomena to think of the Creator of them, to bless him whose power and might fill the world. Nature is inanimate but not inarticulate. To us, as to far-off man, the heavens declare the Glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork. If, unlike primitive races, we fear the storm less, it is not because we are less awe-struck, but because we estimate higher our chances of immunity. We know more of the science of electricity.

It is therefore no matter for apology that the Old and New Testaments, from first to last, both picture the visible Glory of God in various features of the storm. The cloud, the lightning, the thunder are an incomparable staging for the Divine Manifestation. ' When desire blinds the mind with delusion and dust, come with Thy light and Thy thunder ', exclaims the Indian Tagore. The storm, however, is not so much a clarifying agency in Hebrew or Christian poetry as it is a spectacular property. It is spectacular in providing a setting for the Glory ; it is not the Glory itself. For God is not in the wind or the earthquake or the fire, but in the still small voice, as Elijah discovered. Elijah the Tishbite and John the Baptist were possibly for this very reason harbingers rather than accomplishers ; dour foes of Ahab and Herod, these stormy petrels in some sort perchance mistook the thunder for the Glory, scene for drama. Neither had the vision of Jesus and Isaiah, by both of whom the Cloud was seen, but only as a background to the real presence. The Almighty's form may glass itself in tempest on the glorious mirror of ocean, but the form and the tempest are distinct, and the Almighty is not ' form ' at all.

The storm-scene of the Biblical theophanies is, for the most part, well set, but this splendid artistry by no means supports the identification of Israel's Lord—and Israel's Lord is the World's Lord—with the Storm Gods of various mythologies, such as the Ramman-Adad of the Babylonian Pantheon (the Rimmon of Naaman's divided allegiance). Ramman represents a divine revelation in storm phenomena, but it is only possible to so interpret ' Jehovah ' if we omit certain other unfailing concomita of the theophanies in the Biblical narratives. The ninety-

seventh Psalm sums all up in a couplet, and though this Psalm be late its point of view is old :

> Clouds and darkness are round about him :
> Righteousness and judgement are the foundation of his throne.

It is a defect in modern criticism of the Bible that, in its just ambition to proceed scientifically, it tends unjustly to isolate facts from their totality. A chemist must often do this in the course of his experiment, but it is a poor biologist who conceives that by such isolation of elements he can explain or reconstruct an organism. The theologian is more akin to biologist than to chemist. The chemical treatment of the theophanies—and I use 'chemical' in the limited sense indicated—is the weakness of the writer of the strongest of modern theses on the Glory of God. I refer to A. von Gall's book, *Die Herrlichkeit Gottes*, published in Giessen in 1900. It misses being a thorough survey of the facts, for while it deals with the Old Testament, the Targums, the Apocrypha, Apocalypses, and New Testament, it omits the early Rabbinic literature. Within its limitations, however, it marshals and weighs the evidence more adequately than any other work, and yet the author's verdict is one that needs a rider, if not absolute reversal on appeal.

For von Gall holds—and in this he presents extremely a common view—that the Divine Glory, at all events in pre-exilic times, was a purely external manifestation, a manifestation in various natural operations perceptible in storm. The Lord's Glory, in this view, is entirely divested of inner content. It is external and visible, an exhibition of power never of the spirit.

But the same word glory (*kabod*) is very frequently

applied to men. Does it, when so applied, always connote external honour, and never inner worth of soul? The answer to this question would not be decisive as to the meaning of Glory when used of God; but obviously the answer is of some moment as an analogical argument. Von Gall emphatically asserts that, as applied to men, *kabod* exclusively refers to external associations, never to inner qualities. Clearly this is true enough of many usages of *kabod*. In the majority of cases, it may be frankly conceded, men enjoy in *kabod* the esteem acquired by wealth, office, rank, position in life. This conclusion is easily arrived at by a study of the occurrences of the various forms of the root KBD in the Oxford Gesenius. The root denotes heaviness, weight, burden, hence honour. In English, the word 'considerable' corresponds by its double use as to size and esteem. Hence it is inferred by von Gall that no thought of inner grace enters into the sense of *kabod* when applied to man, just as no such thought enters into it when applied to God. But, if so, how comes it that the Greek equivalent (δόξα) of the Hebrew *kabod* loses, when adopted by the New Testament writers from the Septuagint, this purely external sense? Partly, no doubt, because of the Messianic developments of the idea *kabod* as applied to God, but partly because in the Old Testament *kabod*, as used of man, is by no means exclusively an external concept. Qimḥi, like most older and many newer expositors, finds that in several texts *kabod* denotes, not man's outer conditions, but his 'higher soul'. Qimḥi's *Book of Roots* is more than a vocabulary, and his article on KBD is characteristic of the merits of his work. He finds in the idea *heaviness* and *manifoldness* the primitive sense of the root, with

importance as a near derivative. And so the 'higher soul' is called *kabod*, or Glory, 'because it is the glory of the body and its worth.' Qimhi quotes in evidence Psalms xxx. 13, xvi. 9, vii. 6, and Genesis xlix. 6. In the last cited text Jacob denounces the violent propensities of Simeon and Levi, and says:

O my soul, come not thou into their council;
Unto their assembly, my glory, be not thou united.

Here *my glory* would poetically denote soul, spirit, 'the most glorious part of man', as the commentators rightly interpret. So in Psalm xvi. 9:

The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places;
Yea, I have a goodly heritage.
I will bless the Lord, who hath given me counsel:
Yea, my reins instruct me in the night seasons.
I have set the Lord always before me:
Because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved.
Therefore my heart is glad and my glory rejoiceth:
My flesh also shall dwell in safety.
For thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol;
Neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption.
Thou wilt shew me the path of life:
In thy presence is fulness of joy;
In thy right hand are pleasures for evermore.

It is noteworthy how intense are these texts in which *my glory* appears; there is an amazing passion, whether of adoration or of hope, of petition or of joy. Take, again, Psalm xxx. 13, with a verse or two leading up to it:

Hear, O Lord, and have mercy upon me:
Lord, be thou my helper.
Thou hast turned for me my mourning into dancing;
Thou hast loosed my sackcloth, and girded me with gladness:

To the end that (my) glory may sing praise unto thee,
and not be silent.
O Lord my God, I will give thanks unto thee for ever.

And, in addition to these texts quoted by Qimḥi, let us add the magnificent termination of Psalm lvii :

My heart is fixed, O God, my heart is fixed :
I will sing, yea, I will sing praises.
Awake up, my glory ; awake, psaltery and harp :
I myself will awake right early.
I will give thanks to thee, O Lord, among the peoples :
I will laud thee among the nations.
For thy mercy is great unto the heavens,
And thy truth unto the skies.
Be thou exalted, O Lord, above the heavens,
Thy glory above all the earth.

These texts seem decisive. *Kabod*, glory, as applied to men, often represents much more than an external lustre. *Kabod*, honour, is indeed the antithesis to *qalon*, shame ; just as δόξα is opposed to αἰσχύνη (' whose glory is in their shame ') in Philippians iii. 19. But in some of the passages quoted a man's glory is more than men's esteem of him because of his ponderable success or attainment of high place. It is the seat of human character ; a most precious gift of mind and soul. But, as you are aware, the authenticity of these texts has been challenged, on the basis of a very clever and (I must concede) not unattractive emendation. Its author, we are reminded in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, was the Oratorian Houbigant, who in 1777 proposed to read liver (*kabed*) for glory (*kabod*) in all those passages in which *kabod* seems to imply an inward quality. It will be observed that the same consonants occur (KBD), and in fact the same root-meaning explains the two words, *kabod* and *kebed* both implying weight. The

liver is the heavy organ. In Assyrian *kabittu* denotes liver and also disposition (*Gemüt*), being sometimes parallel to heart (*libbu*) and soul (*napištu*).

Joseph Halévy it was who supported Houbigant's guess (based on the Greek translation of Genesis xlix. 6) by citing the Assyrian parallel. In the third volume of his *Recherches Bibliques* (1905, p. 14) he revived Houbigant's suggestion with a force that has given it wide, though by no means universal acceptance. 'It is', he urges, 'only our familiarity with the received text of the Bible, that reconciles us to the association as synonyms of objects so different as soul and honour.' But Halévy fails to see that the point is that honour, applied to the inward character, may well be associated with such inner organs as the heart and more generally with life, and with soul the principle of life itself. As regards the Assyrian evidence, it proves little for the Bible. The liver played a much more important role in Babylonian than in Hebrew literature, and the two Hebraic references to the magical employment of the liver in Ezekiel (xxi. 26) and in Tobit (vi. 4, viii. 2) are both foreign and Babylonian. Reference may here be made to M. Jastrow's elaborate paper on the liver in *Proceedings* (1914) *of the Royal Society of Medicine*, pp. 109 seq. of vol. vii, part 2 (Section of the History of Medicine). 'The liver', he says, 'as the bloody organ *par excellence*—blood being associated with life—was also the seat of the soul.' This is an altogether un-Hebraic thought, for the blood generally, and not the liver specifically, was the seat of the soul (i. e. life: Genesis ix. 4). It was in Babylonia, as Jastrow so strikingly shows, that hepatoscopy—divination by the liver—prevailed. All this is so alien to Judaic thought that it is highly improbable that

Hebrew poets would have cited the liver specifically in the manner Halévy's theory demands. Only once in the Massoretic text of the Hebrew Bible is the liver named in such a context. Lamentations ii. 11 runs :

> Mine eyes do fail with tears, my bowels are troubled,
> My liver is poured upon the earth, for the destruction
> of the daughter of my people.

Here, undoubtedly, the liver is a seat of the emotions—but it is not used in parallelism to *nefesh* or *leb*, soul or heart, but to eyes and intestines—and thus does not really illustrate the occurrence of *kabod* in the texts cited above. The LXX evidence is even less effective. True, in Gen. xlix. 6, the LXX reads *kebêdi* (ἥπατα μου) for *kebôdi*, *my liver* for *my glory*. How little reliance can be placed on that is proved by the opposite fact that in Lam. ii. 11 the LXX reads *kebôdi* for *kebêdi*, *my glory* for *my liver*. If I were addicted to emendations I should prefer Löhr's change of *kebêdi* into *kebôdi* in Lamentations, rather than Halévy's change of *kebôdi* into *kebêdi* in the other text. For, as Löhr remarks, the liver is not a *fluid* organ, and the verb *pour out* hardly fits. Not that this argument is conclusive, for, as Löhr admits, the verb pour out is used of the heart and soul in other Old Testament texts.

On the whole, however, there seems no compelling reason for rejecting the Hebrew text in those passages where *kabod* denotes the mind and soul, the innermost seat of the character and disposition. In Gen. xlix. 6, the Targum (*yeqari*) confirms the reading ' my glory ' against the LXX. Driver happily renders : ' my glory : a poetical expression for the spirit, as the glory or noblest part of man ' ; and this is confirmed by the Oxford Gesenius. Similarly, modern authorities might be cited

in justification of the older exegesis of the Psalmic passages which I have relied on in my argument. But the argument does not depend entirely on these passages as the only evidence in favour of my conclusion. After all, in a predominating mass of the passages in which *kabod* denotes external honour, it is an honour acquired by moral qualities. Only one representative quotation is necessary: Prov. xxi. 21. 'He who follows after justice and kindness, he finds life and honour.' A good life, as Toy comments, is summed up in the two qualities justice and kindness; and the reward is longevity and honour, with riches, too, in iii. 16. The honour may be external enough: men's esteem and approbation, social rank and judicial title, a place among the elders at the gate or a respectful audience at the feet of thrones—but all this accrues not from accidental causes but from the practice of the highest virtues, the possession of noble character turned to worthy ends, which the world worthily esteems. And though this is post-exilic, it introduces nothing foreign to pre-exilic thought.

This line of argument, however, does not necessarily affect the problem as to what the Hebrew Bible intends by *kabod* when applied to God. The Glory of God in pre-exilic texts is a visible manifestation, associated with cloud; sometimes the Glory appears in the cloud, at others the cloud conceals the Glory. Compare the ancient passage, Exod. xxxiv. 5, with the equally old narrative in 1 Kings viii. 10. In the former, in reply to Moses' request to see God's glory, 'the Lord descended in the cloud'. In the latter, when Solomon dedicates the Temple, the cloud filled the holy place, driving out the priests, and preventing their ministration in presence of the glory. In the parallel account in Chronicles fire

descends while the glory fills the House. In another pre-exilic passage, Isa. vi, the chapter descriptive of the call of the prophet, we have the clouds, the thunder, the fire, and the smoke—all storm phenomena. 'Every manifestation of the Glory of God is a storm, and every storm reveals the Glory.' And, concludes von Gall, the revelation is physical, material; never, in pre-exilic ages, is it accompanied by a moral revelation.

But is this true? On the contrary. All the great theophanies, with their storm scenery and visible manifestations, are also revelations of the Divine essence—the Glory of God, witnessed in storm phenomena, is a moral and spiritual Glory. Its most prominent feature is power, but a power directed to righteousness. Examine a few of these theophanies. Habakkuk's prayer is not post-exilic; it is a picture of storm, but it is introduced by a prophecy in which bloodshed is denounced, violence, rapacity, idolatry, and oppression are attacked, and the ideal set out of the time when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. Here all the elements of the Glory are united, the power and the judgement, the external manifestation and the inner message to the soul of the righteous that he shall live by his faith. Or again, Moses would fain see God's glory; and he is allowed a vision of all that mortal eye can see. And as the Lord descends in the cloud he cries: 'The Lord, the Lord, merciful and gracious, abundant in goodness and truth.' Von Gall treats this sentence (Exod. xxxiv. 6) as 'redactional', but we cannot be so complacent to the demands of a theory. W. H. Bennett and Driver both refuse to regard this description of God as aught but a long-established, pre-exilic formulation. And as to

Isa. vi, von Gall's analysis is monstrously inadequate. 'There is nothing ethical in Isa. vi', he says. No detailed reply is necessary. The chapter is instinct with a message of Israel's sin and of God's attitude towards his world. In contrast to von Gall's strange moral belittlement of Isa. vi, let us listen to that fine scholar, G. Buchanan Gray, all too soon removed from us. On vi. 3: 'the whole earth is full of His glory', Gray remarks: '*His glory*: here as in Num. xiv. 21, Ps. lxxii. 10, xcvi. 3, of Yahweh's self-revelation in His dealing with men.' And again: 'This holy, moral power which is revealed to Isaiah in his vision, is Lord of the (heavenly) hosts, and the whole world reflects the lustre of his righteousness. History, human life, is under the government of a righteous power that rules the world, and is not devoted merely to satisfying the unethical desires of a petty nation or tolerating its sins. Isaiah is no exponent, like the author of chapters xl–lv, of an intellectual monotheism, but he is possessed by the moral thought that in due time demanded an explicit monotheistic statement.' Thus Isaiah's pre-exilic vision of the Glory in the year of Uzziah's death, with its angelic and tempest imagery, is a proclamation of right as well as a manifestation of might.

And what of Sinai? Have we only the smoking mountain and no Decalogue? It is urged by many moderns that the 'moral' Decalogue as it appears in Exod. xx and Deut. v is not original. The original Decalogue, associated with the revelation of the Divine Glory, is the 'ritual' Decalogue enshrined in Exod. xxxiv. In that chapter we have a series of commands, which can be reduced to *ten* by a little manipulation, and all of these commands are 'ritual'. In his *Folk-Lore in the*

Old Testament, Sir J. G. Frazer has a passage which sums up, with that eminent stylist's wonted forcefulness, an argument which would commend itself to most adherents of the Wellhausen theories. This is what Frazer says (vol. iii, p. 115) :

' If we ask which of these discrepant versions of the Decalogue is older, the answer cannot be doubtful. It would happily be contrary to all analogy to suppose that precepts of morality, which had originally formed part of an ancient code, were afterwards struck out of it to make room for precepts concerned with mere points of ritual. Is it credible that, for example, the command *Thou shalt not steal*, was afterwards omitted from the code and its place taken by the command *The fat of my feast shall not remain all night until the morning* ? or that the command *Thou shalt do no murder*, was ousted by the command *Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk* ? The whole course of human history rejects the supposition. All probability is in favour of the view that the moral version of the Decalogue, if we may call it so from its predominant element, was later than the ritual version, because the general trend of civilization has been, still is, and we hope always will be, towards insisting on the superiority of morality to ritual. It was this insistence which lent force to the teaching, first, of the Hebrew prophets, and afterwards of Christ himself. We should probably not be far wrong in surmising that the change from the ritual to the moral Decalogue was carried out under prophetic influence.'

This is a more or less conventional position, upheld with much more than less of unconventional lucidity and skill. With its main implication there will be undivided sympathy. By a preference of morality to ritual, or vice versa, a religion grades itself as high or low, as progressive or decadent. Yet, assuredly, this verdict needs safeguards if it is to be rendered impregnable. In

fact, to quit metaphor, the antithesis is unreal. Is it true, without qualification, that ritual precedes morality? Did the Beatitudes precede or follow the Sacraments? Did Magic really precede Religion? When ancient priests performed ritual acts was there no idea behind the ritual? Magic, it seems, was in part primitive science; ritual, assuredly, is in part advanced religion. The Wellhausen theory maintains, and I think rightly, that the Prophets preceded the Law. If I have to date relatively a moral and a ritual Decalogue, I am strongly inclined to put the moral version first. The idealist gives us principles, the ritualist their application. I was writing this part of my lecture on the very day when the news of Woodrow Wilson's death reached and saddened England. Is it not possible to explain the rise and temporary eclipse of Wilson by noting that he was an idealist without the gift of making his ideals work in his immediate environment? He was a prophet without a priest; a statesman without political machinery. It is for us to treasure his ideas and as it were ritualize them. This is always the relation of priest to prophet—the prophet dreams, and the priest forces on the world as much of the dreams as the world can use. Ritual, to keep to our immediate problem, is a degeneration from the ideal. I have, however, discussed this point in *Some Permanent Values in Judaism*, and only now recur to the subject to make my present argument clear.

The so-called primitive Decalogue of Exod. xxxiv is, in fact, only possible in a settled agricultural community, with an established Temple cult. It ends with the command against seething a kid in its mother's milk, on which new light has been thrown by Prof. Max Radin

in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* for April 1924. He contends that this law is directed against an idolatrous cult, namely an Orphic-Dionysian initiation ceremony in which the kid and the milk played a role. But there is no pre-exilic evidence that such a cult was known in Israel. Dionysus cannot be traced in Palestine before the age of Ezra. But without arguing this question more fully, my conclusion may be stated, viz. that the 'moral' Decalogue of Exod. xx is older than the 'ritual' Decalogue of Exod. xxxiv, and that the 'moral' Decalogue is a genuine part of the narrative of the revelation of the Glory of God at Sinai. I am prepared to assert that in the Old Testament the Glory, mostly represented with external manifestations, sometimes with manifestations grossly material, is never dissociated from the ideas which tend to spiritualize what we may term the ritual of revelation. The ritual grows out of the spirit, and the spirit re-enters and refertilizes the ritual.

We see this most clearly as the end of the exile is reached, and we see it there most remarkably. In Ezekiel we meet that most puzzling vision of the Chariot, a vision which gave so much concern to subsequent leaders of Jewish and Christian thought. It had a powerful influence on the New Testament Apocalypse, and much earlier may have even left its mark on the Priestly Code of the Pentateuch. The puzzling point is that Ezekiel's conception is Assyrian, but what of the pre-exilic Isaiah, who can scarcely have been under Assyrian influence? Yet essentially there is nothing inherently different between Ezekiel's vision, when the heavens were opened by the river Chebar, and Isaiah's experience in the Temple in the year when King Uzziah died. The

difference is that Isaiah is majestic while Ezekiel is grotesque, and that Isaiah points forward messianically more clearly than Ezekiel does. To both prophets, however, the vision is accompanied with a moral mission ; and moreover to both of them the vision implies the universal diffusion of God's glorious holiness among men. Isaiah's Seraphim proclaim ' Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts, the fulness of the whole earth is his glory '. The holiness and the glory go together, both are adorable and adored. And Ezekiel? He, too, hears the voice of a great rushing, while cherubs cry ' Blessed be the glory of the Lord ', *mimekomo*—' Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place.' Even if we read with Luzzatto : ' When the glory of the Lord rose from its place ', the sense is unchanged. Ezekiel possibly originates the thought that whereas previously the Glory of God only existed when manifested, now the Glory existed continuously, whether manifested or not. The Divine Glory tends, in all religious thought, to become a quality inherent in the essential nature of God. Mainly it continues a quality of power, demanding homage ; but it is also a quality of mercy, revealing itself not in upheaval but in pacification, not in judgement but in pardon. As Augustin puts it, the final goal is ' the peace of God's city, a most orderly coherence in God, and fruition of God '. The earthly city glories in itself, the heavenly glories in God (*City of God*, xii. 16, xv. 11, 13). And this is the counterpart of the manifestation of God's works towards man, for Augustin (xi. 27) aptly quotes Ps. xlvi. 8 : ' Come and behold the works of the Lord, what wonders he hath wrought upon the earth.' The divine quality, which resides in God as glory, shows itself in acts of glory in nature and in the

soul. Christian and Jewish thought is here at one. For not only in theory but in the fact of worship, Isaiah and Ezekiel affected literally Jewish and Christian adoration —the trisagion derived from angels above sounds among men below—wherever God's children gather, be it in synagogue or in church. I wish I could with equal assuredness add in Mohammedan mosque or in Buddhist temple. Not that the adoration is entirely absent from either of these last-named shrines, but it expresses itself in other forms.

It is from the Hebrew Bible that the idea of natural revelation permeates literature. The idea is scarcely Greek, especially because the latter tends to identify Nature and Will, an identification which the Hebrews avoided. To the Hebrew it is the Good that is manifest, not the Arbitrary. At all events, there is nothing, outside the Bible, so impressive as the Nature Psalms. When I say that it is not Greek, I do not mean to exclude Philo. He makes great play with the idea of natural revelation. One recalls Immanuel Kant's famous words more readily, it is true, than one recalls Philo's. Once (as we may read in Wallace's *Kant*, p. 52) Kant held a swallow in his hand, and gazed into its eyes, ' and as I gazed it was as if I had seen into heaven '. This is a very fine touch, it adds something new to the Hebrew modes of thought. For to the Hebrew the things seen, through which God is seen, are always impressive in themselves. But to Kant with his swallow, as to Wordsworth with his primrose, the things seen may not be of intrinsic value. As E. L. Grant Watson says (*English County*, p. 7) : ' The things seen [and described in his book] are of little importance. It is what they reveal or half reveal with which I am concerned, for

I know that from the contemplation of the simplest appearances arise secrets and miracles. It is the reality behind the mask that snares and enraptures.' Kant, however, not only records his sentimental experience with the swallow, with the heaven-depths in its eyes. It is true that a Rabbi would tell us that God uses the most insignificant instruments, and might slay a Caesar with a gnat. It is true that an Evangelist would ask us to consider the lily, and the royal gnomist the ant, as monitions against anxiety or sloth. But the thought is not quite the same as seeing eternity in a swallow's eye. Here Kant points not back to the East but forward to the West, not back to David but forward to Wordsworth. Thus the latter terminates his Ode on Immortality :

> Thanks to the human heart by which we live,
> Thanks to its tenderness, its joys and fears,
> To me the meanest flower that blows can give
> Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears.

Kant, none the less, harks back to the Psalmists. He, too, like the Hebrew poets, read God in the skies and argued for him thence to the human soul. Far more to our point is Kant's personal confession in the famous words : ' The starry sky above me, and the moral law within me—these are two things which fill the soul with ever new and increasing admiration and reverence.'

These words are cited aptly enough in the commentaries on Ps. xix, with its two sections, on God in Nature and God in the Law, the great Psalm of the announcement of God's glory in the universe and of the Law (the world's glory, in Rabbinic phrase) for man. The expositors who quote Kant might also quote Philo (I. 625–6). ' Of the works of creation two things are

holy—heaven, which immortal and blessed natures pervade, and the mind of man, which is a fragment of the Divine. . . . Not unreasonably, methinks, have both of them been called praiseworthy; for it is these two, heaven and mind, which are able to show forth praises and hymns which bless and honour the God and Creator.' Then, with a clear reminiscence of Ps. xix, Philo continues: 'Man has received this glorious distinction above all other animals to worship God, and heaven is ever making melody with the perfect harmony of the spheres. If the sound thereof could reach our ears, ungovernable love would overcome us, wild desires, and insatiable yearnings. We should refrain from all life's necessaries, and be nourished no longer as mortals by food and drink through our throats, but like those about to become immortal, through our ears by inspired strains of perfect music.' (Cf. C. G. Montefiore, 'Florilegium Philonis', in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vii, p. 537.)

The nineteenth Psalm is a 'proper' Psalm for Christmas in the Church liturgy. It may even be, as Mr. Colson suggested to me, that Charles Wesley's noble Christmas hymn was in its original form inspired in part by this Psalm, and not as now appears entirely by Luke. Compare two stanzas of the 1743 version with the version found in modern hymnals:

Wesley, 1743.	Modern Hymnals.
Hark, how all the welkin rings Glory to the King of kings Peace on earth and mercy mild, God and sinners reconciled.	Hark the herald angels sing Glory to the new-born King; Peace on earth and mercy mild, God and sinners reconciled.
Joyful all ye nations rise, Join the triumph of the skies; Universal nature say Christ the Lord is born to-day.	Joyful all ye nations rise, Join the triumph of the skies; With the angelic host proclaim Christ is born in Bethlehem.

But why is Ps. xix used as a Christmas Canticle? I have found the reason in Augustin's note. '*The heavens declare the glory of God*: the heavens, I say, that is the Saints, will declare the glory of God; raised up aloft from earth, hearing God, thundering with precepts, lightening with wisdom, will declare that glory of God whereby we are saved.' And, of course, the bridegroom in his canopy represents Christ. This kind of symbolism is not rare in the Jewish Midrash. The Sun corresponds to the Kingdom of David, of whom it is said in Ps. lxxxix. 36, 37:

> Once have I sworn by my holiness;
> I will not lie unto David;
> His seed shall endure for ever,
> And his throne as the sun before me.

The moon is the Sanhedrin, which sat in crescent-shaped array (Mishnah Sanhedrin iv. 3), while the Stars are the Sages and their disciples, according to the words of Dan. xii. 3: 'And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.' This Rabbinic symbolism (for some of which see § 23 of the Introduction to the Midrash on Lamentations) is closely akin to that on which Augustin relies.

It would, however, be superfluous to follow the poetical influence of the Hebraic conception of the glory of God as revealed in nature. Philosophically, the veneration of nature had to be curbed. The Targum would even deny to the heavens themselves active declaration of the Glory, for it renders Ps. xix. 2, 'They who behold the heavens declare the Glory of the Lord.' Here the Targum was a little too punctilious. But there is a not unnecessary caution in the Rabbi's question:

' Is God ever angry ? ' and in his answer, ' Yes, every day ', quoting Ps. vii. 12 :

God is a righteous judge,
Yea, a God that hath indignation every day.

' How long does the divine anger last ? ' asks the Rabbi. Meir said : ' At the hour when the sun shines out, and all the Kings of East and West set their crowns on their heads and worship it—then is the Holy One filled with wrath ' (Talmud, Berakoth *7a*).

It is none the less from the nineteenth Psalm—and from similar Hebraic utterances—that the Western world derived its conception of the Glory of God revealed in his works. The Stoics, it is true, originated the philosophical argument for the existence of God from the order and beauty of sky and earth. Philo adapted the argument to the Scriptural account of Creation, using even the parallel of the builder, to be found in Cleanthes, while couching the argument in phrases taken from the opening chapter of Genesis. Heine, in his *Harzreise*, so soon as his boorish companion has gone away, sees nature regain her magic. ' The trees began to speak again, the sun-beams regained their melody, the meadow flowrets to dance, while the blue sky embraced the green earth. Yes, I better understood—God created man to admire the splendour of the world. Every author, be he never so great, desires to have his work praised. And in the Bible—the Memoirs of God—it is expressly stated that He created man for His praise and glory.' To Heine it is beauty, to Philo it is order that speaks. Says the latter (on *Monarchy*, i. 4) : ' The character of workmen is invariably to be estimated in some sense from their works. For who, looking on statues or pictures, but forms an idea of the statuary or the

painter himself? Or who, when he beholds a garment, a ship, or a house, but forthwith conceives a notion of the weaver, shipbuilder, or architect who made them? So, on entering a well-ordered city, the conclusion is that it is governed by wise and virtuous rulers. He, therefore, who comes into that greatest of cities, this world, and who views the land, hills, and plains, with their teeming animals, plants, and streams of rivers both overflowing and dependent on the wintry floods and the steady flow of the sea, and the admirable temperature of the air, and the varieties and regular revolutions of the year's seasons; and then the sun and the moon, the rulers of day and night, and the regular motions of all the other planets and fixed stars, and of the whole heaven;—would he not naturally, or I should rather say of necessity, conceive a notion of the father, and creator, and governor of all this system, for there is no artificial work whatever which exists of its own accord? And the world is the most artificially and skilfully made of all works, as if it had been put together by one altogether accomplished and perfect in wisdom.'

We will not attempt to trace how out of all this grew scholasticism—which, when it was supposed to be syncretizing Reason with Revelation, was merely syncretizing a literary with a rational tradition. Out of this grew, again, the opposition between Religion and Science, and what was even more devastating, the division of Religion into Natural and Revealed. This was very strongly felt in England in the middle of the eighteenth century. It was in 1754 that Bolingbroke urged the superiority of natural over revealed, or as he calls it supernatural, religion. 'We need no spectacles', he cried, 'the naked eye suffices' (*Works*, iv. 233). Again: 'The missionary of supernatural religion appeals to the

testimony of men he never knew, and of whom the infidel he labours to convert never heard, for the truth of those extraordinary events which prove the revelation he preaches ; but the missionary of natural religion can appeal at all times and everywhere, to the present and immediate evidence, to the testimony of sense and intellect, for the truth of those miracles which he brings in proof : the constitution of the mundane system being in a very proper sense an aggregate of miracles.' Now, had Bolingbroke known more of historical theology, he would have realized that the very language he uses against revealed religion was used in favour of revealed religion by its truest advocates. Whoever put together the two poems which now constitute the nineteenth Psalm, and they were put together very early, gave birth to the conception of that ' daily renewal of the work of creation ' which figures in the Synagogue Liturgy. The ' reconciliation ' of Science and Religion in our day is due to a resumption of the Psalmist's conception. Both science and religion become personal, the one the result of a personal observation, the other of a personal experience. It is because of this re-intrusion of the personal element that a reconciliation is not only possible, but inevitable, for the same personality is involved in both sides of the argument. Is this to say that science, like religion, is growing more mystical ? The Psalms attained the personal harmony without mysticism. The heavens declare the Glory of God daily, continuously to the open eye of each ; and the Glory of God is declared, too, in the Law fixed in the soul of every man. God is seen in his perfect universe and also in his perfect Law—there is no dichotomy here, there is a complete unity between the Glory of God in his creative activities in the world of matter and also in the

world of spirit ; in his ordering of things and in his message to the heart of man.

How does man respond to this message ? God's glory is most revealed in His moral excellence : it is moral excellence that produces the excellence of the creation. ' Purity and rectitude are before his throne ', runs the same liturgy as has just been quoted. And man's response consists in the exhibition of the same purity and rectitude. More manifest than in the storm, the Glory of God is made visible in the life of man.

He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his Maker,
But he that hath mercy on him, glorifieth Him.

Man's oppression denies the perfection of the world, man's mercy asserts that perfection. Man's imitation of the merciful God is an assertion of the Divine Glory. So, too, is man's service in general. That is the climax. The Glory of God is expressed most gloriously in the Servant passages—those superb portrayals of Israel as the Lord's missionary—his agent in opening the prisons of the human spirit, in bearing a light to the nations. Ah ! how Jeremiah (xiii) lashes him who should be servant but has become rebel ! Israel—bound to God with a close-fitting girdle—' to be unto Me a name and a praise and a glory '—this people goes after other gods —and so the girdle shall be unfastened, cast away in the hole of the rock by Euphrates, till it become marred and profitable for nothing. ' Hear ye : be not stubborn : give glory to the Lord your God, before he cause darkness, and before your feet stumble upon the frowning mountains ; and, while you look for light, he turns it into the shadow of death. But if ye will not hear it, my soul shall weep in secret for your pride ; and mine eye shall weep sore, and run down with tears, because the Lord's flock is taken captive. Say thou unto the king and to

the queen-mother, Humble yourselves, for your headtires are come down, even the crown of your glory.' How indeed shall man have glory if he glorify not God? Ichabod! Jeremiah's warning was vain, and Jerusalem fell. So must every city fall that is deaf to such an admonition.

Then came the great prophet of the exile with another message from the mountains, which no longer frown but smile. The glad evangel comes over the hills that the Glory of God is nigh its consummate revelation, and Israel is to be restored to the dignity of the Servant in whom the Lord is glorified. No need to quote more than two short passages (Isa. lx. 1, 19 and lxi. 3). 'Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.' The glory of the City of God is in part the recognition by the whole world of God's justified love for Israel, but it is far more than this. 'For the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory.' How? 'They shall be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord that he might be glorified.' A fine figure, taken up again and again in the pseudepigraphic and Pharisaic literatures—a fine figure which comprehends both aspects of the Glory idea—God manifest in nature's fertility and in man's virtue; trees of righteousness, man's spirit taking on the firm rootedness and steady growth of the tree, worthy to be called the planting of the Lord, and the joyous mouthpiece of his praise. Then 'the Throne of God is fixed where the Tree of Life was' (*Adam and Eve*, xxii. 4). Is it a dream, more Messianic than present? It is assuredly man's perennial obligation to actualize in part at least the vision which he owes to his Messianic aspirations. For the Day of the Lord is every day, just as the Glory of God is seen at every sunrise.

II

MESSIANIC

Who can approach Thy seat?
For beyond the sphere of Intelligence hast Thou
established the throne of Thy Glory;
There standeth the splendour of Thy veiled habitation,
And the mystery and the foundation.
Thus far reacheth Intelligence, but cometh here to
a standstill,
For higher still hast Thou mounted, and ascended Thy
mighty throne,
And no man may go up with Thee.

This stanza is quoted from Mr. Israel Zangwill's translation of Ibn Gabriol's *Royal Crown* (p. 102). Grateful should we be to the editors of the series of 'Jewish Classics' for placing in our hands so rich a mine of religious thought. Yet the stanza shows how little of a mystic this eleventh-century Hebrew was. His philosophical *Fons Vitae* is, indeed, neo-Platonic, but his poetical *Royal Crown* is through and through Aristotelian. The Divine Glory is only attainable rationally, and mundane reason cannot make the ascent. Hence the Glory itself is unreachable. The mystic is not content with this admission of incompetence. 'If the earthly man gets into resemblance with the heavenly man, thereby keeping his image (ṣelem) and form (demuth) like the heavenly model, then when he perfects all his limbs to the perfection of the religious life (miṣvoth), he becomes a very chariot and throne of glory, in the image of the upper chariot and throne, and therefore our sages

said : the Fathers, they *are* the Chariot.' By a combined exercise of the mystic imagination and practical will for goodness, a combination almost invariable in Jewish mysticism, an untrammelled experience of personal freedom with a complete surrender of self to a divine Law. Isaiah Hurwitz in his famous *Two Tables of the Covenant* (fol. 38 *b*) thus expresses man's competence to reach the Throne of Glory by constituting himself within a miniature of it, in the very act of obedience to a dominating power without.

Ibn Gabirol, however, does not admit that the Glory of God is mystically realizable by mortal man. He follows up the stanza quoted above with the lines :

O Lord, who shall do deeds like unto Thine ?
For Thou hast established under the throne of Thy glory
A standing place for the souls of Thy saints,
And there is the abode of the pure souls
That are bound up in the bundle of life.
They who were weary and faint here await new strength,
And those who failed of strength may here find repose ;
For these are the children of rest,
And here is delight without end or limit,
For it is The-World-To-Come.

That souls after death dwelt under the throne of Glory, there enjoying the radiance of the Glory itself, is a common Rabbinic thought (Berakoth 17*a*). Immortal man is in a superior position to mortal. This accords in part with scriptural teaching, which wavers between admitting Moses to an open vision (Deut. xxxiv. 10) and denying him the open vision (Exod. xxxiii. 20). The Glory of God is not so much a manifestation, it is too intimately God himself manifest, for the vision of it to

be permissible to mortal gaze. So Maimonides (*Guide*, I. liv) explains the experience of Moses (basing his view on Midrash) thus: Moses asked for two boons: (*a*) Show me thy way, and (*b*) Show me thy Glory—i. e. he wished to have direct knowledge of God's method of government and also of God's essence. The one boon was granted—he was shown all God's goodness and mercy; the other boon, the vision of Glory, was denied—Thou canst not see my face and live. Philo, whom curiously enough Jehuda Halevi later on echoes, quite unconsciously, in his *Cuzari* (iv. 3), holds (i. 285) that God's punishments and benefits accord with man's receptive power; the divine oracles are not conditioned by God's own eloquence, but by the capacity of those to whom they are addressed (i. 253). 'Show me thyself', asks Moses—to Philo (as in a sense to Maimonides) God's Glory is God's self. God's reply in Philo's paraphrase (ii. 218) is 'I can but show you what you are able to receive.' Somewhat later (interpreting Proverbs xxv. 16):

> Hast thou found honey? eat so much as is sufficient for thee;
> Lest thou be filled with it to sickliness,

the Rabbis applied the first line to Ben Azzai, and the second line to Ben Zoma; the two lost, one his life, the other his reason over the Gnosis. Verily of theosophy a little is enough! Calvin took up the Philonean thought, declaring not only that the fatal premonition of too bold a gaze prevented 'stupid curiosity', but that God uses a human, not a divine measure, in his self-revelation to men. This reminds us of the Stoic Epictetus' retort to a would-be student to whom he refused to discourse. No, said he, I cannot teach you. There is an art of speaking and an art of hearing. You have not

learned how to hear. The *fatality* of the complete vision in the Scripture (not always maintained, for contrast Exod. xxiv. 10 with Exod. xxxiii. 20) is, naturally, not identical with incapacity to attain the vision. Nor is the earlier Talmudic conception identical with the medieval. It is one thing to say that a man cannot enter the Gnostic Garden (Pardes), it is another thing to say that he can enter only with fatal consequences. Nachmanides, with the possible precedent of the Syriac version, makes a gallant attempt to blunt the contrast by rendering Exod. xxxiii. 20, ' No man shall see me *while he is alive* ', which no doubt, with its admission of the idea of *incapacity* instead of *fatality*, accords with later Jewish thought, but can scarcely be upheld as a translation of the text. In Deut., while men as a rule ' cannot see God and live ', Israel at Sinai and more particularly Moses did enjoy this immunity. But the spectacle was too terrible for Israel to desire its repetition (Deut. iv. 33, v. 21).

This thought, that a complete knowledge of God's Glory is impossible to man in his mortal phase, whether because of the lethal effect of such knowledge or of man's natural incapacity to acquire it, or of the terrifying nature of the experience, is akin to the parallel thought that the full fruition of the experience is reserved for the Messianic age. Undeniably, the Glory of God tends, in the Old Testament, as in the New, to become a Messianic concept.

The expectation that the divine Glory will be made splendidly manifest with the coming of the Kingship of God is not only a natural hope, it is also a sound foundation of optimism. For, after all, the Kingship is of this world, even though its coming and its acknowledgement

inaugurate a new world. Such Kingship is prophetic, not apocalyptic. Prophecy, as Dr. Charles has pointed out, differed from Apocalypse in that, while the latter for the most part despaired of earthly justice and happiness, the former—while throwing the great day forward into a more or less vague future—never divorced heaven from earth, though it regarded both as in need of remaking. To Prophecy the remaking was less catastrophic than it was to Apocalypse, but to both the coming of the Kingdom was to be marked by a manifestation of God's glory in storm and tempest, physical still but also spiritual, in judgement and requital on a sinful and arrogant humanity—Israel excepted. In fact it was because Israel had previously suffered beyond his deserts that he was to be the primary recipient of the Glory under the new conditions. To the greatest of the prophets, however, the same gift was to be the lot of the nations, they too would share in the vision of the Glory, they too would share in the temporal and eternal consequences of the vision.

The universality clearly has close connexion with the spirituality of the Glory. If the spirituality be, as I contend, pre-exilic, it would be strange, therefore, if the universality were entirely a Messianic conviction—found only in the exilic and post-exilic literature. It is largely Messianic, but not entirely. Is Numbers xiv. 17 ff. really post-exilic or Messianic? The passage repeats what is one of the oldest depictions of God—the phraseology of verse 18 being perhaps the most firmly attested formula of Israel's first appreciation of the justice and moral essence of Deity. In his mercy God will forgive at Moses' word, and then comes (verse 21) the universalistic note. 'And the Lord said, I have pardoned according

to thy word ; but as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the Glory of the Lord.' Von Gall eagerly pronounces this verse post-exilic, and some other moderns place it with him in the age of Ezekiel. But Kuenen's argument for a seventh-century date is very forcible ; and one is happy to note how many first-rate authorities have accepted Kuenen's view (see the *International Commentary*, *Numbers*, p. 155).

But Numbers xiv. 21 does not stand alone. What of the admittedly pre-exilic Isaiah vi. 3? 'The whole earth is full of His glory '—this is no future contemplation, but a present reality. There is no need to wait for the Messianic age, God's Glory already permeates the universe. ' The whole world ', as G. Buchanan Gray comments, ' reflects the lustre of God's righteousness '—reflects it now. *Lustre*, so the Targum has it (*ziv yeqarêh*) —' the lustre of his Glory '. True, it is the seraphim who in Isaiah vi ' contemplate the universal diffusion of the Glory as a present fact '—not as an ideal yet to be realized. But Isaiah shares the present conviction, for he expresses no surprise whatever at the angelic claim.

On the whole, however, the universality of the Glory belongs to an advanced stage of the conception. Very remarkable is the case of Egypt. Ezekiel speaks of God as becoming known to Egypt, but in the old sense of realization of God's power in disaster. Isaiah xix. 22 announces also that the Egyptians will know God, as a chastiser indeed, but as one whose chastisement is fatherly, smiting being mitigated by healing. Thus, in this passage at least, the old *naïveté* has passed away. No longer is Pharaoh's heart hardened that God may be glorified by Egypt's sufferings. Paul not only persisted in the older idea, but he even generalized it. God's

providence is arbitrary—so he argues in the ninth chapter of Romans. God favours Moses, and plagues Pharaoh; Moses experiences divine grace, Pharaoh divine severity. Like the potter, God makes vessels of honour and dishonour—a doctrine which almost invites the terrible irony of Omar Khayyam. Pharaoh was raised up that God might exhibit his power by felling him. Paul uses this whole argument to counter the Jewish claim to permanent election, and it is effective enough for its purpose. How difficult it is to avoid the recrudescence of olden *naïveté* is seen, again, from a passage in the Fourth Gospel (John ix. 1 ff.). Jesus passed by and saw a man blind from his birth. 'And his disciples asked him, saying, Rabbi, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind?' The first part of the answer that follows is an advance on previous thought. It is a denial that disease is due to sin—though modern eugenists would possibly cast the blame of pre-natal defect on to an erring parent's shoulders. 'Jesus answered, Neither did this man sin, nor his parents.' So far the doctrine is an advance. But note what follows. No sin preceded, then why was the man born blind? 'That the works of God might be manifest in him.' God's glory is to be shown in the healing; the man was born blind, that Jesus might cure him and win divine renown. Here there is a partial falling off from an earlier doctrine, that of Sirach, who describes the doctor's skill as coming from God, and thus as tending to God's glory, for verily the Lord created him (Ecclus. xxxviii. 1 ff.).

In the course of his argument, Paul cites Exod. xxxiii. 19, a sentence which occurs in the narrative of the revelation of the divine Glory to Moses. 'I will be

gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy to whom I will show mercy.' This is idiomatic Hebrew, and as Driver remarks ' the second *will* in each case is a simple future, it must not be emphasized as though it meant *wish to*, θέλω.' (Unless, that is, we treat θέλω as a simple future, which is unlikely in Romans, but probable enough in John iii. 8.) Driver curiously enough, while referring to Rom. ix. 15, omits to refer to Rom. ix. 18, where this very emphasis is made. ' So God hath mercy on whom he will (θέλει), and whom he will (θέλει) he hardeneth.' In the Talmud, Rabbi Meir reads the same text differently (Berakoth 7*a*). He thus interprets : ' I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious—altho' he may not be deserving ; and I will show mercy on whom I will show mercy—altho' he may not be deserving.' Arbitrariness enters Meir's thought as it enters Paul's, for the Rabbi, like the Apostle, regarded temporal prosperity or adversity as dependent in a sense on the divine whim. But God's final mercy is not constrained by any limitations. In his unqualified grace his glory is seen. On Meir's exegesis of Exod. xxxiii. 19 is based a well-known Rabbinic parable, one of the most charming of all the parables in literature. ' When the Holy One made all his goodness to pass before Moses, He showed unto him all the treasures of recompense stored up for the righteous. Moses asked (pointing to a heap) : Master of the world, whose is *this* ? This, replied the Holy One, is intended for the almsgivers. And whose is *that* ? It is designed for those who support orphans. Questions and answers went on concerning every store, until Moses saw a particular treasure, and inquired : Whose is this ? And God answered, to him who hath deserved I give of his

appropriate store, but to him who hath nothing merited, I give freely, for I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and I will show mercy on whom I will show mercy.' It was the treasure of the treasureless, grace making good lack of works, and glory manifesting itself in unbounded love.

Yet for real unsurpassable eloquence on the universality of the Glory we must turn to the overmastering prophet of the sixth century B. C., Deutero-Isaiah. As he, too, is a most explicit formulator of the Hebrew monotheism, so his conception of the Glory comes into line with his monotheism. ' It is ', as G. Buchanan Gray so well says in his *Hebrew Monotheism* (p. 20), ' in the sixth century that Yahweh, still intensely personally conceived, is the one God beside whom no other exists, whose purpose unifies history, whose providence unifies all nations of mankind, who has made himself known in history in order that knowledge of Him, the one true God, may be brought to all mankind.' For (Isa. xl. 5) ' the Glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together '. If the Glory is specifically located in the Temple, so that ' his resting-place shall be glorious ' (Isa. xi. 10), it will be a Temple which all nations shall seek (Isa. ii. 2), in that great day when ' the earth shall be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea ' (Isa. xi. 9). Thus the universality of the second Isaiah is matched by similar thoughts incorporated in the first Isaiah, but not to be regarded as belonging to his actual orations.

One point must here be emphasized. Isa. lviii is the bridge between the Messianic and the pragmatic incidence of the realization of God's Glory. This chapter is perhaps Messianic, but it is a message of an earthly

morality, leading up to the future culmination. ' Thy righteousness shall go before thee and the Glory of the Lord shall be thy rearward ' (lviii. 8). This ' righteousness ', which precedes, is freeing the oppressed, feeding the hungry, housing the orphan, satisfying the afflicted soul. ' Righteousness ' can scarcely mean ' justification '. We have the same thought in Isa. lii, though the metaphor is slightly other. ' Be ye clean, ye that bear the vessels of the Lord ', and then, ' the Lord will go before you, and the God of Israel will be your rearward ' (lii. 11, 12). So in lviii. 8 the meaning must be that Israel's moral excellence precedes, and God's vindication in glory follows.

This is the pragmatic value of all Messianic ideals. The ' Interim Morality ' conception of the ministry of Jesus has just this worth. Schweitzer was faced by the objection that his eschatological theory makes it difficult to understand why, if the end was so near, it was profitable to deal—as Jesus does—with the moral life of our world at all. His answer is that the very fact that this ' Interim Morality ' was announced under the exaltation of a great hope gives that morality both a higher glow in itself and attaches to it a more permanent validity. It was at once a local and a universal, a temporary and an enduring message. It seems to me that unless we read all our eternal Messianic ideals *sub specie humanitatis* those ideals fail to touch us. Judah b. Simon said : ' Whatever God has designed for the future life, he has done in anticipation by means of the righteous in the present life ' (Genesis R. c. 77, beginning). The curious tractate known as the *Tana debe Eliahu* belongs in its present form to the tenth century A. D., but its contents are much older. A frequent refrain is that

175172+

' Whatever God is to do at the End, he has done in part to-day '. And so the beautiful Prayer entitled *Shield and Quickener* by Sa'adiah (892–942), ends with the sentence : ' Yet in every generation didst Thou make plain part of the mystery of Thy Name.' There is something fantastically fascinating in the thought, again, of Sully Prudhomme, who in the middle of the last century wrote the verses which he entitled *L'Idéal.*

La lune est grande, le ciel clair
Et plein d'astres, la terre est blême,
Et l'âme du monde est dans l'air.
Je rève à l'étoile suprême,

A celle qu'on n'aperçoit pas,
Mais dont la lumière voyage
Et doit venir jusqu'ici-bas
Enchanter les yeux d'un autre âge.

Quand luira cette étoile, un jour,
La plus belle et la plus lointaine,
Dites-lui qu'elle eut mon amour,
O derniers de la race humaine !

This star, fairest and farthest off, has not yet become visible, but its light is travelling on, and in each age men may love it, living the present in the light of the Light to come.

It will have been observed, perhaps, that while in Isa. lii. 11 it is ' the God of Israel ' who will be the nation's rear guard, in lviii. 8 it is ' the Glory of the Lord ' that fills the function. We have a yet more striking instance of the same variation if we compare Isa. xi. 9 with Hab. ii. 14. These two prophecies must have been close together in date, with Isaiah slightly earlier. Habakkuk foresees a time when ' the earth shall be filled with the Knowledge of the Glory

of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea'. Quoting Isaiah, Habakkuk substitutes 'Knowledge of the Glory of the Lord' for 'Knowledge of the Lord'. Similarly, in some passages in Ezekiel, the 'Glory of the Lord' seems to stand for the Lord himself. Be all this as it may, we certainly have later on a substitution such as we have noted in Habakkuk. It is quite clear that, as the text of Exodus now stands, God's glory is identified with God. 'Show me *thy Glory*', asks Moses. 'No man shall see *me* and live', is the answer (cf. on this point Maimonides, *Guide*, I. lxiv). But we are dealing now with a later period. In 1 Enoch xiv. 20, the 'Great Glory' seated on the crystal throne with wheels as of a shining sun, clearly represents Deity. Moreover, if 'glory', used of man, denote (as argued on p. 22 above) man's essential nature, it is not surprising that in later Hebrew phraseology we find God quoted as using the phrase 'my glory and my very self' (Numbers Rabbah, ch. iv, § 6). In the Targum, however, to speak of the 'Glory of God' when God himself was intended becomes not a primitive identification or even association of God with his visible manifestation, but a sophisticated substitution, made in the interests of a delicate antipathy against material presentations of Deity. This substitution is a marked feature of the Targums, or Aramaic paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible. To these Targums we must now turn, not to probe the problem to its depth, but to avoid leaving our treatment of the subject even more fragmentary than it would otherwise be.

Briefly, then, when the Hebrew text presents God in personal contact with man, the Aramaic uses three words which avoid the suggestion of human form or passion in the Deity—anthropomorphism and anthropo-

pathy, to use the favourite terminology of the pedants. Maimonides (*Guide*, i. 28) already pointed out that whereas in Exod. xxiv. 10 the Hebrew text runs: 'there was under His feet as it were a paved work of sapphire', the Aramaic Version (Onkelos) reads: 'Under the throne of His glory.' *Yeqara*, glory; *memra*, word; *Shekinah* (or *Shekintah*), lit. 'dwelling', whence 'Presence'—are the three substitute words in the Aramaic, though only one of the three (the third) has survived in common Rabbinic usage. A reason for this will be offered in a moment. *Memra* ('word') lies outside our present topic; but *yeqara* is the exact Aramaic equivalent to the Hebrew *kabod*, or glory. The Targum uses *yeqara* in many passages where *kabod* is not used in the Hebrew text. Whether the Targum ever meant *yeqara* to denote God himself, and not merely his visible presence in glory, is debated by Maybaum and Von Gall, who take opposite sides, as do at the present moment two of the most accomplished Christian students of Rabbinics, G. F. Moore and G. H. Box. So are the best plans of men defeated! For, according to a Talmudic legend (Megillah 3*a*), when Jonathan von Uzziel translated the Prophetic books into Aramaic, a Voice from Heaven (Bath Qol) cried: 'Who is it that reveals my secrets to the sons of men?' And Jonathan rose to his feet in protest. 'I am he!' he answered. 'But not for my glory nor for family glory have I laboured, but for Thy Glory, that disputes may not increase in Israel.' Nothing has given rise to more disputes, in and out of Israel, than certain phenomena of the Aramaic Targum. On the whole it would seem that the older Targum uses *memra*, word, not as Philo uses *logos*, but to express the invisible presence of God in man; *yeqara*, glory, to

express the visible appearance of God ; while *Shekinah* (*Shekintah*) applies to both the visible and invisible Presence, especially when it is conceived not only as a momentary revelation, but as a continuous religious experience.

The supersession of the other terms by Shekinah is a wonderful fact, the significance of which has not been appreciated. The Glory of God ceases to be a mere Messianic ideal, it becomes a recurrent force in human life. It *remains* a Messianic ideal, for full fruition. But though this full fruition is a far-off divine event, yet to it the whole creation now and ever moves. It is a plausible suggestion that John had the Shekinah in mind when he spoke (i. 14) of the Word or Glory as 'tabernacled' (ἐσκήνωσεν) in man, though the fourth evangelist is thinking rather of a definite past episode than of a permanent present vision. When the Rabbis gave vogue to Shekinah out of the three possible terms, they must have felt it desirable to have an expression which would apply equally to spasmodic and continuous, to local and universal, to earthly and heavenly, to visible and invisible manifestations of the holy spirit in its connotation of Glory. For this reason, too, the Shekinah in Hebrew, like the δόξα in Greek, becomes mostly associated with *light*. Light has at once a physical and spiritual sense ; it can denote a light seen to the eye, and a light kindled in the soul. Light may be near and yet emanate from a distant focus ; it may be a steady luminary or a sudden flash-light. It is true that very occasionally in the late Hebrew literature the Shekinah appeals to other organs than the eye—to the ear. So, sound—the Voice whether of the Thunder or the Word—predominates in some of the Biblical passages (e. g.

Ps. xxix, Deut. iv. 12). It is not, however, true that the Shekinah would ' tinkle as a bell '—as Blau, Abelson, and others assert on the basis of a single Talmudic passage (Sotah 9*b*). We have there a simple play on words, with no exegetical or theological import. On the contrary we find, on the self-same page, the great principle that truth needs no physical reinforcement. Samson, surrendering to Delilah's blandishments, loses the divine Shekinah. How did he know of his loss ? How did Delilah know that she had extorted the whole of her lover's secret ? Comes the magnificent generalization : ' Truth is perceived of itself.' How much would religion have been spared had men trusted more to this divinely given intuition ! When, again, the Rabbis Samuel and Levi *heard* the Shekinah approach in the Shaf-we-Yatib Synagogue of Nehardea (Megillah 29*a*), they heard the sound of a movement, like the coming of angels. (' *Shaf*, He *moved* away from the Temple, *ve-yatib*, and *settled* in Babylonia—the name of a synagogue in Nehardea, a reference to the belief that the Divine Majesty went with Israel, into the Babylonian exile ' ; Jastrow, *Dictionary*, col. 1538*b*.) This is quite in accord with Ezekiel's rushing imagery, but such passages as I have just quoted from the Talmud are extremely rare. Even where the perception of the divine Glory is by means of the sight, there is a reluctance to permit the experience to be over-materialized. The blind Rabbi Sheshet, it is true, could not perceive the Shekinah. But nowhere do we find it asserted, in general, that for the experience of the Glory physical eyesight was necessary. There will be no blindness in the Messianic age (Isa. xlii. 7), but neither was there any blindness at Sinai, said the Rabbi.

There is a radiant glory in the very association of the Glory of God with radiance. There are always, in Hardy's phrase, ' impercipients ' who cannot see at all ; just as no one, however percipient, can see all or clearly. On the road to Damascus (Acts xxii. 6) a great light surrounds Paul, and he could not see the road to Damascus from the glory of the light. But he has the inner experience which converts him into an apostle of Jesus. Similarly, at the Transfiguration, with details derived from the story of Moses, Jesus' face shines as the sun. So did Moses' face shine (Baba Bathra *75a*) as the sun, Joshua's as the moon—as the homilist (M. Joel) explained, Moses with original, Joshua with reflected light. This point is badly taken, for the Talmud referred to the quantity rather than the quality of the light. It is never original, always derived. God it is who illuminates. *Dominus illuminatio mea*, the Latin version of Ps. xxvii. 1, is a fine guiding idea for a seat of learning so august as the University of Oxford. Illumination is a more desirable gift than scholarship. It effects more than learning. At the close of his essay on ' Vitality ' John Tyndal quotes (in his own version apparently) these lines from Goethe :

> Who dares to name His name,
> Or belief in Him proclaim,
> Veiled mystery as He is, the All-enfolder ?
> Gleams across the mind His Light,
> Feels the lifted soul His might
> Dare it then deny His reign, the All-upholder ?

To Goethe, to Tyndal, it is Light with correlated might that convinces. ' The analogy of light ', writes Sylvanus Thompson, ' by which the illumination of the soul by God is continually presented in religious thought, is so wonder-

fully appropriate that no other has been found equal to it in intensity of meaning or in extent of application.' For, as the brilliant scientist and equally brilliant exponent of the intuitions claimed by the Society of Friends points out, while other analogies and metaphors may mislead, the analogy of light is justifiable. ' Light, in the physical world, is that which reveals, makes manifest, discovers objects outside ourselves, even distant objects. Light, working on the appropriate sense organ, informs, educates, awakens, and directs. On the organic world of animal and vegetable life it operates vitally ; it purifies and stimulates. All these things have their analogy in the spiritual sphere. For the individual possesses an organ, whether we call it his soul or conscience, something in himself to which the idea of righteousness appeals ; and the Spirit of God, acting in or through this faculty, reveals, makes manifest, informs, educates, and directs the soul.'

This, however, is not quite all. For there is another quality of light on which Rabbinic thought oft insists. It is not altogether the same as Philo's fine saying (i. 7) that while reason is the image of God (cf. Col. i. 15, Heb. i. 3), light is the image of that image. Philo implies that the inner light is a reflection from without. The Rabbis thought rather of the fact of kindling than of reflection, though they thought of reflection also. Light is kindled from a source of light without darkening the original source, and then the secondary light becomes itself an active source. Only God himself drew the original Light from no previous source (Pesiqta R. 183*a*) ; man's light is always derived. This range of thought empowers the conception of the Shekinah, under the metaphor of light, to bridge the gap between the tran-

scendent and immanent God. The Law in such contexts has its part also. The Candelabrum in the shrine was lit by human hands, but the light that thereupon spread its illuminating rays far and wide was the light of the divine word. Yet, however interpreted, the Glory of God, visualized spiritually as well as physically in the Light of the Shekinah, plays much the same role in Rabbinic Judaism as the logos does in Philonean or Johannine theology.

Have I exaggerated the extent to which, in Judaism as we know it, the Glory of God expresses itself in terms of light? The clouds have gone, the earthquake, the wind. Out of the primitive storm associations the only physical feature that endured was the illumination. Let me cite another piece of evidence, by calling attention to one of the most serviceable and popular of the Jewish translations of the Bible, Saadiah's Arabic version. Bacher compares the influence of Saadiah's tenth-century Arabic version to the influence of Moses Mendelssohn's eighteenth-century German version, both being cultural forces. In fact this is true of all the important translations of the Bible—the Septuagint Greek, Jerome's Latin Vulgate, Luther's German, the English Authorized—all of these had considerable place in the history of civilization. The outstanding characteristic of Saadiah's version is its simplicity. It leaves no difficulties, it makes the reader doubt whether there *are* any difficulties. It is a racy rendering, probably the most intelligible ever compiled. Now if we turn to the record of the supreme experience of Moses, when he received his response to his petition for a sight of God's glory—how the word *light* shines through Saadiah's version here! 'Let the Lord, I pray thee, go in the midst of us' (Exod. xxxiv. 9)

becomes in Saadiah ' Let *thy light* go among us '. In xxxiii. 14, ' My presence shall go with you ' becomes ' *My light* shall go with you '. In xxxiii. 19, ' all my goodness ' becomes ' all *my light* ', and in xxxiii. 22, ' while my glory passeth by ' becomes ' while *my light* passeth ', and again, ' they shall see the end not the beginning of *my light* '. As a final instance, here is Saadiah's rendering of Isa. lii. 8 : ' How beautiful is the cry of the sentinels, their voices raised in joyous unison, when they see face to face the return of the *light* of the Lord unto Zion.' Now in most of these texts, the Targum has Shekinah where Saadiah has Light.

We owe much to Maimonides, far more than we do to Saadiah. But the latter has helped us in our present quest more than the former. Maimonides does not help us to understand the idea of the Glory of God. When the text (Exod. xl. 34) tells us that ' the Glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle ', this means to Maimonides that the divine perfection made itself rationally perceived. He makes a grudging concession : ' If, on the other hand, you prefer to think that the glory of the Lord is a certain light created for the purpose—we have no objection ' (*Guide*, I. xix, cf. i. 28). But Maimonides' readers have a profound objection ! For there would be nothing of present worth in the idea of the divine light if it were merely a special, miraculous creation, and not a constant fact of human life. Maimonides just missed the touch of mysticism which would have moderated his rationalism, and would have made of him a leader instead of a scholastic.

Our medieval Hebrew poets also are less helpful than we could wish. This, however, is to put it unfairly. The poets are so good that they rouse in us unreasonable expecta-

tions. The best, as the Greek said, is the enemy of the good, and an unsatisfied ideal is apt to dissatisfy us with the accomplished reality. Still, I could wish that our Hebrew poets were less fond of postponing for a future life the realization of the Glory of God. We cannot tolerate the inscription, over this life's gate, of a caution not to approach the Throne. No such depressing warning was written by Rabbinic Judaism over the pathway of the Shekinah. Rabbinic Judaism is here far in advance of Alexandrian Judaism. Philo denies the possibility of the full beatific vision till after the soul's sleep comes the soul's awakening. He admits the possibility of what he calls 'fruition of light' here and now, as the prize won by the soul's wrestling, yet he allows the possibility to very few, to the peculiarly gifted. But we wish that all men may be prophets—not only the rare and chosen spirits. So we would have the Glory of God, the possession, within the reach if not within the grasp, of all simple souls, at all stages of their pilgrimage, in the terrestrial as well as in the celestial stages. Not even the Beatitude contents us. 'Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God' (Matt. v. 8). They shall see, but they even see. More contented are we if we interpret the Beatitude by means of Matt. xviii. 20, and of Paul's utterance (1 Cor. xiii. 2), 'for now we see in a mirror darkly, but then face to face'. Only in this sense does the medieval poet content us. I quote again from Mr. Zangwill's translation of Ibn Gabirol (p. 86):

> Thou art Light celestial, and the eyes of the pure shall behold Thee,
> But the clouds of sin shall veil Thee from the eyes of the sinners.

Thou art Light, hidden in this world but to be revealed in the visible world on high.
'On the mount of the Lord shall it be seen.'
Light Eternal art Thou, and the eye of the intellect longeth and yearneth for Thee.
'Yet only a part shall it see, the whole it shall not behold.'

After all, to be just to Ibn Gabirol, he (like Philo before him) does not deny the vision entirely, only the entirety of the vision. This is the common teaching of all religious writers. In his *Cuzari* (iv. 3) Jehuda Halevi has a long and eloquent passage on the Glory of God, in which he discriminates three aspects of it—the aspect visible to common humanity, the cloud and the fire; the aspect which rare individuals, like the prophets, might perceive by their understanding of God's relations with humanity; and finally the aspect too transcendental for attainment even by the most gifted of men. Persons, he explains illustratively, with weak sight can only see in the shadow; the stronger eyed can see in the sunlight; no eye, however, can gaze into the bright sun itself. This analysis does not greatly differ from Philo's in the past, or from Maimonides' in the near-coming future—for Jehuda Halevi's death almost synchronized with Maimonides' birth. But while in his philosophy Jehuda Halevi is less mystical than Ibn Gabirol is in *his* philosophy, in his poems Halevi is more mystical than Ibn Gabirol is in his poems. Halevi does not quite give us Philo's epigram that real blindness is of the soul, not of the eye. Nor does he give us Paul's yet more beautiful phrase 'the eye of the heart'. But like many other Jewish thinkers and poets, he fully conceived the notion of the soul's eye, a notion derived through the Arabic from Plato (Republic 533 A).

You will find the Arab-Jewish exposition of the *ten* senses, five inner senses corresponding to five outer, in David Kaufmann's essay *Die Sinne*. Later Judaism thus well knew of the eye of the soul, so that (as Lucretius writes) : ' What nature denied to man's mortal sense, he feasted on with his mind's eye.' We must not, however, be diverted into these comparative speculations, but must restrict ourselves to Jehuda Halevi :

Pure souls have seen Thee, nor needed other lights ;
Their mind's ears have heard Thee, though their ears were deaf.

I have just said that we must avoid comparative digressions. But I cannot refrain from quoting the magnificent lines of the blind Milton, who after lamenting his loss of physical eyesight, adds the immortal appeal (taken, we are told, from a medieval Latin predecessor, but made Milton's own by the superb colouring of the borrowed plumes) :

So much the rather thou, celestial light,
Shine inward, and the mind through all her powers
Irradiate ; there plant eyes, all mist from thence
Purge and disperse, that I may see and tell
Of things invisible to mortal sight.

Or let me quote Jehuda Halevi just once more—the poem in which he sings :

The Creator who discovereth all from nothing,
Is revealed to the heart, but not to the eye . . .
Remove lust from the midst of thee ;
Thou wilt find thy God within thy bosom,
Moving gently.

This poem is now available in English and Hebrew, in full, in Nina Salaman's edition which forms the second volume of the Jewish Classics series. In this poem

you will find the outer manifestation of the Glory of God and its inner realization almost perfectly expressed. But it is quite perfectly expressed in the greatest line this greatest of Hebrew medieval poets ever wrote—greater even than his epigram that ' Israel is the heart of the world '—I mean the line :

Look on the glories of God, and awaken the glory in thee.

And further :

O that my dream might hold God in its bond !
I would not wake ; nay sleep should ne'er depart.
Would I might see His face within my heart !
Mine eyes would never ask to look beyond.

III

PRAGMATIC

'For contemplation he, and valor formed'—so Milton describes his Adam. The ideal must be Hellenically absolute as an object of thought, but it must become Hebraically pragmatic as an element in life. In his *Eight Chapters* Maimonides adopted the Aristotelian doctrine of the mean—the good lying between two equally bad extremes. But his exposition grows less Hellenic as he proceeds, until he arrives at one of the noblest of Hebraic principles. Rightly does Maimonides suggest that the authors of this principle were inspired when they enunciated it. Let us listen to the termination of his fifth chapter in Dr. J. I. Gorfinkle's version: 'The sages of blessed memory have summed up this idea in so few words and so concisely, at the same time elucidating the whole matter with such complete thoroughness, that when one considers the brevity with which they expressed this great and mighty thought in its entirety, about which others have written whole books, and yet without adequately explaining it, one truly recognizes that the Rabbis undoubtedly spoke through divine inspiration. This saying is found in Mishnah, Aboth, ii. 12, and is, *Let all thy deeds be done for the sake of God.*' This sums up the motive and the end. The end is conduct, the motive is to glorify God.

Hillel bathed as a religious duty, to keep clear his body made in the image of God. The thought occurs frequently, and belongs to the early part of the first

century. Wash face and hands and feet daily (Sabbath 50*a*) ; and again, more fully (Tosefta Berakoth, iv. 1) : ' None shall taste food without previous thanksgiving—as it is said (Ps. xxiv. 1) : " The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world, and they that dwell therein." He who enjoys temporal pleasures without benediction has so sinned as to outlaw himself from virtue. No man shall exercise eyes (lit. countenance), hands or feet, except for the glory of his Maker, as it is said : the Lord hath made everything for His own end.'

This last text from Proverbs (xvi. 4) is usually translated nowadays in a different sense. The R.V. renders : ' The Lord hath made every thing for *its* own end.' This translation has much in its favour. But the older A.V. accepts the traditional Jewish exegesis : ' The Lord hath made all things for Himself ', and the recent American Jewish version retains it : ' for His own purpose '. I call this exegesis traditional, and it is supported by the use made of other texts. Consider, for instance, the so-called sixth chapter of the Mishnaic tractate entitled *Fathers*, otherwise the Chapter of R. Meir, on the Acquisition of Torah. In no other passage of the same length is the essence of Pharisaism so lucidly presented. But we are now concerned only with the conclusion, which I cite in S. Singer's translation : ' Whatsoever the Holy One, blessed be He, created in His world He created but for His glory, as it is said (Isa. xliii. 7) : Everything that is called by My name, it is for My glory I have created it, I have formed it, yea I have made it.'

To act for the Glory of God, to act with the most unselfish motives—thus become synonymous. In Westminster Abbey, as Mr. L. E. Tanner points out, expressing reconditely a thought which Longfellow had expressed

more simply, much of the more subtle splendour was wrought for the Glory of God—' for the Glory of God, for some of the most beautiful things in the Abbey Church can hardly be seen ' by human eyes. It is a great thought that man makes beauties for the exclusive eye of the All-seeing Deity. God penetrates not only the inner heart of man, but he sees also the most refined of man's aesthetic accomplishment. Not in plastic art alone, but in the art of living, the same truth may hold, and human life yield at its best a flavour and a colour perceptible only by God, and enjoyed only by God. Even charity, says Augustin (*City of God*, iii. 2, ix. 6), is no sacrifice, unless it be done for God. Earlier the Pharisee said that sin for God is better than virtue for a less lofty end (Horayoth 10*b*). (With regard to this last citation it may be incidentally remarked that this page of the Talmud is wholly occupied with a discussion of the problems of motives, so little is it true that the Pharisaic system was only a mechanical set of rules.) This is all dangerous doctrine, this of Augustin's and the Rabbi's. The Rabbi thought that Tamar's incontinence was not to be judged as sin, while Zimri's was; the one was induced by a desire to raise up holy seed for the patriarch, the other was indulgence in mere sensuousness. Augustin (v. 14) reconciles, on grounds of motive, Matt. vi. 1 (' be not seen of men ') with v. 16 (' let your light shine '). ' Do not well ', he expounds, ' with an intent that men should see you do so, and so turn to behold you, who are nothing of yourselves; but do so that they may glorify your Father in heaven, unto whom if they turn they may be such as you are.' The self-glorification is only rendered more subtle; it is not removed by this comment. Moreover, all this is dangerous doctrine, unless we add

the rider that act as well as motive counts, and the other Rabbi was a true psychologist who held that good acts will eventually be done for good motives, whatever the prompting that set the actor on his course of beneficence. The beneficent becomes the benevolent, until the perfect harmony of the Psalmist's ' clean hand and pure heart ' is attained. But the great principle that, as Philo puts it (I. 348), 'tis God's to benefit, man's to glorify, is a true expression of spiritual idealism. ' Blessed be our God ', says the Synagogue liturgy, ' that he has created us for his glory.' ' If any one shall say that the world was not created for the glory of God, let him be anathema ', enacts a Church Council. Well might it so decide, in the light of the exalted thought that occurs several times in the New Testament. ' Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God ' (1 Cor. x. 31). This may be described as the Jewish form of the idea. In Col. iii. 17, the form is Christianized: ' And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him.'

But the phrase which became most influential in Christianity is that found in 1 Pet. iv. 11, ' that in all things God may be glorified '; we may concede the Apostle as inspired as Maimonides held the contemporary Rabbi. In St. Benedict's Rule (c. lvii end) this text becomes, not as the Vulgate has it, ' ut in omnibus honorificetur Deus ', but ' ut in omnibus glorificetur Deus '. Hence, as Professor F. C. Burkitt has pointed out to me, the initials I O G D formed and still form the motto of the Benedictines—an honourable enough badge of devoted service. Very striking is the context in the Rule. St. Benedict had been cautioning the

monastery artificers against over-much pride in their Hall, and adds : ' If aught of the fruit of their labour be sold, let them that have the handling of the affair see to it that they do not dare to practise any fraud therein.' Then, after citing the awful example of Ananias and Sapphira, the Rule concludes : ' In settling prices let not the vice of greed creep in, but let the things be sold somewhat cheaper than they can be by laymen, that *in all things God may be glorified*.' That this supreme formula should occur in so homely a context does not surprise those who recollect how often, in parallel contexts (e. g. T. B. Yoma, 86*a*), the Rabbis appealed to a similar formula, the *sanctification of the Name of God*. Is it not here true, as almost always, that when we get down to bed-rock we encounter the identical human nature, and that Benedictine and Pharisee had more ideals in common than either might have been ready to admit ? ' It is a man's duty to make a martyr of himself to pay his debts ', said Judge Snagge at the Bow County Court, not long ago. Benjamin Disraeli and Walter Scott proved their adhesion to this truth, the one at the beginning, the other at the end of his literary career. The very pride of which Benedict disapproved becomes pardonable in the light of this principle. As St. Bernard said : ' We must esteem ourselves neither less nor more than God has made us ', just as earlier sages interpreted Eccles. vii. 16–17 (Yoma 22*b*) to mean : do not pose as over-righteous lest you become over-vicious. You cannot be God, then be not devil—but just be human ! But, to revert, I O G D is a good and godly motto. But men never will leave well alone. The Jesuits went one better with their A M D G (*ad maiorem Dei gloriam*). I am not among those who accept all the conventional condemnation of

Jesuit methods, but enough is proven to incline one to describe the motto as over-protestation of virtuous ends. Not that the comment applies to this Order only. All sects are inclined to take God's name in vain, presuming and boasting to be working for His glory when they are scheming for their own. ' In hoc signo ' may camouflage a worldly ambition. Not without pathos is Simon b. Yoḥai's saying that God's Name, graven at Sinai on Israel's weapon, was obliterated when Israel sinned (Echa R. Intr. xxiv). Sin was the enemy of Glory. Nor would she tolerate any injuria spretae formae.

Yet the Pharisees in particular have laid to their charge a form of folly combining both offences. They refused openly to receive Jesus, for they ' loved the glory of men more than the glory of God ' (John v. 44, xii. 43). In the former passage the charge is that a false valuation is placed on claimants for Messianic rank ; in the latter, that fear of being ' put out of the Synagogue ' was the cause of vacillation. Both motives were no doubt real enough, and not blameworthy. There was genuine hesitation to accept the new belief, and a natural desire of those who did so accept to remain within the Synagogue. On the one hand men are not lightly convinced, on the other they do not willingly cut themselves off from their former loyalties. The majority belonged to neither category, and they shared the contempt of those who preferred the glory of men to the glory of God. They had witnessed the glory of God in their history, and were not likely to undervalue it, in presence of the growing obloquy of men. Jews and Judaism were not held in such high esteem in the Roman world, under which the new Christian community and its literature rose, for there to be much inclination to prefer men's

applause to the applause of God, which way lay martyrdom, not worldly honours. Gregory Nazianzen so realized this that, just as Philo thought the Patriarchs servants of the law by the light of nature before Sinai, so he thought the Jewish martyrs Christians by the light of nature before Calvary. But my reason for citing Gregory here is to use a phrase from chapter vi of his oration on the Maccabees, pronounced in the fourth century on a first of August—the then date of the Maccabean festival of the Church. 'We have but one glory—contempt of all glory!' they cry. They narrate their experiences of God, and exclaim to the tyrant Antiochus—who stands as the worldly tempter throughout the ages—'Cease to promise worthless advantages, for we seek no honour in dishonourable things'—*οὐ γὰρ τιμησόμεθα τοῖς ἀτίμοις*. Gregory here shows his understanding of Judaism, of that great-souledness (*μεγαλοψυχία*), to use another of his applied phrases, which from century to century inspired the Jew to prefer death for God to dishonourable honours of men. A curious difference of linguistic idiom may here be noted in passing. In Rabbinic dialect 'magnanimous' in the form 'large of spirit', *gâs ruâḥ* means 'proud'; cf. the Biblical 'high of heart'. The great-souled would be rather the *shefal rûah*, 'low of spirit', for to the Hebrew humility was magnanimity. One may overdo the assault on pride—and Sallust is not entirely beyond our sympathy when he expresses contempt of those whom neither glory nor danger excites to heroism. 'Who seeks no glory here, is fit for glory there' is none the less a heroic sentiment (Pesikta R., p. 2*a*). And was Aqabya unheroic when he refused to express a sham conformity with conventional views even when the reward of high

office was dangled before him? 'Rather would I be called fool for life, than be traitor to God for an hour' (Eduyoth v. 6). Again and again Pharisees (e. g. Eleazar b. Hyrqanos in Baba Meṣia 59*b*) protest that they act not for their own glory, but for God's, when refusing to abandon unpopular opinions. Assuredly they were sometimes sincere in such protestation! The very azarah (temple court) cries out: 'Hence! Isaachar of Cephar Barqai—who honourest thyself and profanest the sacred things of heaven' (Sabbath 57*a*). This dandified priest wore silken gloves at the altar, so that the flesh of the sacrifices should not soil his dainty fingers (compare the story of the family of Euthenos, the incense-mixers, in Yoma 38*a*).

'What is the chief and highest end of man?' asks the larger Westminster Confession. And it answers: 'A man's chief and highest end is to glorify God, and fully to enjoy him for ever.' This is a sublime opening of a Catechism. How reminiscent of the Mishnaic denunciation of pride in those who studied or practised the Torah: 'Claim not merit to thyself, *for thereunto wast thou created*' (Aboth, ii. 9). This was an utterance of Johanan ben Zakkai, and is at least as old as Luke xvii. 10, 'Seek not greatness for thyself, and desire not honour' (Aboth, vi. 5). The true crown is other—'we crown ourselves, crowning Thee'. Pride taints the earth and compels, as it were, the Glory of God to depart from it; with the humble the Glory dwells. I think that I ought to translate the whole comment of the Mechilta on Exod. xx. 21 (ed. Friedmann, p. 72*a*): 'And Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was: it was his humility that gave him entry, for it is said (Num. xii. 3), Now the man Moses was very meek. The

text thus informs us that whosoever possesses this quality will eventually cause the Glory of God (Shekinah) to dwell with man on earth. For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and lofty place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit (Isa. lvii. 15); and again: The Spirit of the Lord is upon me to preach good tidings to the meek (Isa. lxi. 1)—not "to the pious", comments R. Joshua b. Levi, but "to the meek"; and further: For all these things [heaven and earth] hath mine hand made, but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and that trembleth at my word (Isa. lxvi. 2); and yet again: The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise (Ps. li. 17). Contrariwise, whoever is haughty of heart defiles the earth, and causes the Glory of God to depart thence, as it is said: Him that hath a high look and a proud heart will I not suffer (Ps. ci. 5). The proud of heart are called an abomination, as it is said: Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the Lord (Prov. xvi. 5), just as idolatry is called an abomination, as it is said: Thou shalt not bring an abomination into thine house (Deut. vii. 26). Just as idolatry defiles the earth and removes the Glory of God, so does pride produce the same ill effects.'

Nor might man serve himself with a glory derived from the glory due to God. Annihilation was the desert of him who made use of the Crown (Aboth, i. 13). Hillel who for humility is the Pharisaic counterpart of Moses—Hillel it is who pronounced that severe condemnation. God would do the crowning. It is unnecessary to expound at any length the ideas associated with the Crown of Glory wreathed by men for God and reciprocally

placed by God on men's brows. Dr. K. Kohler has provided the necessary references efficiently in his article on the subject in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (vol. iv, p. 370). There is, however, one idea connected with the Crown that may be added. No adornment would seem more external, yet with much charm this outward symbol is turned into an inner grace.

Thus the prayers of men are gathered by the appropriate Angel and set as a garland on the forehead of the Most High. The Crown is woven out of prayer, heart-service, to cite the Rabbinic phrase (see *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, vol. ii, ch. xi). It is made not with hands but with the spirit. The idea is fully played on, till all its music is extracted.

But there is more in it than is conveyed in these passages. For the prayer, with which these passages deal, is vocal prayer. Innermost prayer is unspoken. This silent prayer the Midrash beautifully derives from the forty-fifth Psalm. 'My heart overfloweth with a goodly matter'—heart, comments the Midrash, not voice. The sons of Korah, who indite the Psalm, did not die (Num. xxvi. 11), but because of their silent agonies of repentance were saved to teach men the value of inner adoration. 'A parable: it is like a Matrona who saw three on their way to crucifixion. She redeemed them instantly. Later on she saw that they had risen to the office of bearers of the imperial Eagles. So the sons of Korah went with their father, the earth swallowed him, but his penitent sons became prophets, lilies.' For observe that this Psalm is headed 'upon Shoshanim'. Prof. Langdon has shown us that this is a Babylonian musical cliché. But the older exegesis rendered *shoshanim* by 'lilies'. In Rabbinic metaphor, the lily among the

thorns is oftenest vocal, the single competent leader in a group of incompetents, leader in offering consolation, leader in reciting prayer; but in the passage before us the very reverse is the case. Again the point is illustrated by a parable. A King entered a province, and the provincials came to crown him with a crown of gold inset with precious gems and pearls. But the royal retinue protested that the King wished no such gift. 'He asks of you', said they, 'naught but a garland of lilies.' And the people were glad. So was it with Korah's sons. God required not golden censers, for, said he, 'mine is the silver and mine the gold (Hag. ii. 8). And as for incense? It is an abomination unto me (Isa. i. 13). What do I indeed require? Lilies!' The sons of Korah exclaimed: 'We are the lilies', and the Holy One rejoined: 'Ye have conquered'—with a play again on the heading of the Psalm. These sons of Korah are spoken of in the Song of Songs (vi. 2), according to the same Midrash. 'My Beloved is gone down to his garden, . . . to gather lilies.' The people who looked on said: they are thorns, for they are with the thorns; and thorns are destined for the fire (Exod. xxii. 5), and so was Korah and his company consumed (Num. xvi. 35). But Korah's sons, who were lilies, were plucked from between the thorns, for God snatched them away and saved them, that they might beget seed to glorify Him.

The pragmatic bearing of all this is obvious. The Glory of God is, to a large extent, placed not merely within human reach, but under human control. It can be attracted or repelled. Admittedly, Pharisee like evangelist limited this pragmatic reach and control. (See the long note on Matt. v. 8 in Strack and Billerbeck's Commentary.) To die was to go to glory, and there are

Old Testament texts which were used as pegs for this conception (Ps. lxxiii. 4; Isa. xi. 10). Only in 'the state of glory', to cite the Christian phraseology, 'is man perfectly free to good alone'. The strange thing about all this, however, is that the worldly phase is from a modern viewpoint superior to the other-worldly. God will be *seen* beyond the grave, and despite the tendency to spiritualize the vision, nevertheless the linguistic sensuousness of the ultimate realization is remarkable; it is a return to the most primitive conceptions. In the same way, it is only in the next world that security accrues. 'I shall be as the dew unto Israel' (Hos. xiv. 6) is interpreted Messianically by the Midrash. Just as the dew injures no one, so in futurity the righteous will satisfy themselves with the radiance of the Divine Glory and will suffer no injury. This, too, is primitive, although it is a feature of the ultimate hope. Yet I must not forget that there is progress in the conception of a pilgrimage, as the Psalmist words it, from strength to strength (Ps. lxxxiv. 7), or in the Apostle's phrase 'from glory to glory' (2 Cor. iii. 18), to see God in Zion with unveiled face. But heaven is no mere 'vision of fulfilled Desire'. Even Browning weakened his great admonition that reach must exceed grasp, by adding 'or what's a heaven for?' Heaven does not fulfil desire, nor tighten grasp. It widens scope of vision and reach; amplitude, not accomplishment, is the celestial note. Much less primitive is the thought, common to most great religions, that all men come short of the Glory of God while striving to attain it in their earthly life. The Throne of Glory, in the old Hebrew tradition, was pre-mundane; it is also post-mundane. Between lies the human yearning both to revert and go forward. We are

not content with Enoch's view (xlv. 4) that Adam had and lost the light which will only return with the Messiah. All is not dark between. There is another difference. To go to glory is to be glorified; here man glorifies, even though it be, as Augustin has it (on Ps. xxxix. 4), 'dicendo non faciendo'. Not completely, for no poet or singer can exhaust God's praises. 'To recount without ornament' is Philo's notion of a perfect laud (i. 348). Yet there is vast scope for man's glorification of God in doxology, while to sit in the place of worship is itself glorification (Gen. R. xlviii. 47). Again it is unnecessary to cite the evidence; the Psalms, the appeals to the whole of Nature, such as in the Song of the Three Children in the Apocryphal addition to Daniel; most quaint of all the *Chapter of Song* (Pereq Shirah) of which the reader will find an intriguing account in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. xi, p. 294.

The pragmatic worth of the whole conception largely turns on the questions of control, ubiquity, and universality. Judaism cannot claim that its literary expositors have always taken the wider views. The Shekinah is too often treated as circumscribed by time, place, and personality. Rabbis shared something of the Philonean aristocratic limitations, nor was the older Platonism or the medieval scholasticism more democratic. Most regrettable is it that, in Dr. L. Blau's phrase (*J. E.* xi. 260), the Shekinah is sometimes represented as 'shunning the Gentiles'. This narrowness and bigotry is most emphatically and unpleasantly expressed in a passage which Blau omits. It is only fair to cite the whole passage (Berakoth 7*a*), which I take in Dr. A. Cohen's version (p. 37): 'R. Johanan said in the name of R. Josê: Three things Moses sought of the Holy One,

blessed be He, and He granted them. He sought that the Shekīnāh should rest upon Israel, and He granted it; as it is said: Is it not in that Thou goest with us? (Exod. xxxiii. 16). He sought that the Shekinah should not rest upon the other peoples of the world, and He granted it; as it is said, So that we are distinguished, I and Thy people (ibid.). He sought that God should show him His ways, and He granted it; as it is said, Show me Thy ways (ibid. verse 13).' The fanaticism is not lessened, though it is partially explained, if Bacher is right in detecting in the second of the three clauses an anti-Christian polemic. Each side would deny the presence of God in the other. It is impossible, however, without qualification, to call Josê b. Ḥalafta a fanatic. For the self-same Rabbi held that in the Messianic age the peoples of the world will all, of their own accord, become proselytes to Judaism (Aboda Zara 3*b*), thus, in Pharisaic phrase, sheltering themselves under the wings of the Divine Glory. Men are, fortunately, imperfect haters as well as defective lovers. With all their deep-seated particularism, the Pharisees rose to universalistic heights. They recognized seven heathen prophets (Baba Bathra 15*b*). To their everlasting credit they appointed (Berakoth 58*a*) a benediction, still incorporated in the Synagogue liturgies, to be recited on beholding non-Jewish sages: 'Blessed are Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hast imparted of Thy wisdom to those whom Thou hast created.' And even more apt to our present point is the benediction (loc. cit.) to be pronounced on beholding the Kings of gentile peoples: 'Blessed . . . who hast imparted of Thy glory to Thy creatures', or according to another reading (in each formula), 'to flesh and blood'.

To flesh and blood, for if man shares God's quality he shares His glory. Especially is this said of Abraham, who loved his fellow men as God loves all men. Abraham therefore received the boon of old age—a symbol of divine duration. 'Thou hast seized my *métier*—come wear my robe' (Yalquṭ on Ps. lxxi). As with virtue, so with avoidance of vice. He who resists his passions, or as the Rabbinic phrase goes, 'sacrifices his yeṣer', honours God now and hereafter (Sanh. 43*b*). The Rabbis, like the translators of Luke xvii. 21, by an inspired perversion of Hos. xi. 9, give us the splendid epigram—God is within you! Man must not misuse himself—but must (the Rabbinic metaphor is very strong) so behave as though the Holy One (or Holiness) dwelt within his very bowels (Taanith 11*b*). For God is the heart of Israel (Echa R., Introd., § 16). And the participatory aspect is oft expressed, perhaps nowhere more effectively than in Simon b. Laqish's comment on Isa. lx. 1. Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the Glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. 'My light is thy light, and thy light Mine', says God to Israel, 'I and you will go together and give light unto Zion' (Pesiqta, Buber, p. 144*b*).

Hence, though the experience of the Shekinah is frequently represented as circumscribed to time and places and persons, there is also a strong current of thought towards representing it as ubiquitous and universal. The two currents run right through the Rabbinic field of vision, and we are not disappointed when we find them meandering also in the realm of the Glory. Thus when the Temple fell, according to Samuel b. Naḥman (Rosh Hashana 31*a*) the Shekinah left earth and returned to heaven whence it had descended to

dwell in the Sanctuary of Jerusalem. With exquisite pathos the Talmud describes the ten stages of the gradual and unwilling withdrawal of the Glory—how it passes from Mercy Seat to Cherub, from Cherub to Cherub, thence to the Threshold, the Court, the Altar, the Roof, the Wall, the City, the Mount, the Desert, and finally, with lingering steps and slow, it rises skywards, as it is said : I will go and return to my place. But against this we must set the fine thought, very often expressed, that wherever Israel goes the Shekinah accompanies them, in exile exiled, in redemption redeemed. I suggest that as soon as it became evident that, so far as men could then foretell, the destruction of the Temple and the dispersal of Israel were final, the old localization of the Glory of God entirely evacuated Jewish theology, becoming relegated to the Messianic age, when the localization would be renewed, in the very universalistic sense, however, of the second Isaiah. In the meantime the Shekinah becomes ubiquitous, found everywhere, homed in heaven but present on earth, just as ' the sun shines in its place and out of its place ' (Mechilta on Exod. xx. 22). No spot is empty of the Glory (Cant. R. iii. 8) ; its habitat is co-extensive with the world (Esther R. on i. 1). It matters not in which direction you turn your face in prayer, for the Shekinah is in every place (B. Bathra 25*a*). Shall the Glory of God be restricted to heaven, while the Law of God moves and influences men on earth ? Nay, cries the Midrash on Ps. xc. 17, Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us ! ' Where Thou hast set Thy Law, 'tis seemly to set Thy Glory.'

There is divine economy in the distribution of the Glory. Are the righteous scarce ? God planted them over all the generations (Yoma 38*b*), leaving no age

destitute. But the fewness is Israel's own fault. The inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the experience of the Glory, passed to the virtuous students of the Law when prophecy ceased (B. Bathra 12*a*), and matters not revealed to Moses were revealed to Aqiba (Pesiqta, 39*b*). I cannot understand why the Pharisees are abused for arrogance because of such a remark. Surely if we are to maintain the continuity of the incidence of the divine spirit in man, and not treat the incidence as a special providence exclusive to a few rare souls, then Aqiba was inspired as Moses was. Truly there are degrees of inspiration, and one star differeth from another in glory. But each star has its own glory after all, though the quality and quantity vary incalculably and immeasurably. Man cannot reach God's glory, but with his artist's colours he can picture it (Exod. R. xxxv end). Not every one can reach Moses' glory, but with his pure life he can snatch a ray from the nimbus, or rather Moses himself will impart it, as he did to Joshua.

Hence we find a rule for the acquisition of the Glory, a generalization of the conditions necessary for winning it. The rule is partly passive, and, to repeat the epithet I have already used, aristocratic. (See L. Blau in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, xi. 260). But the very fact that the restrictions are generalized at all implies the very opposite of restriction. And indeed it is also generalized in a manner which removes all idea of restriction whatever. Judaism has always laid great stress on the communal aspect of morals and religious practice. But it is possible that in no other matter does it more earnestly attempt to harmonize its communism with individualism than in its treatment of the personal contact with God. Every one is an individuality, unlike

all others. On all and on each is thrown the corporate responsibility. Each must therefore say : ' for my sake the world was created ' (Mishnah Sanh. iv. 5). But the generality has its duty, for, as we shall see, more than once we read of men worthy to receive the Shekinah, but deprived of the glory because of the unworthiness of their contemporaries. You lose the Glory yourself, and—worse crime—you steal it from others. Could any moral be more pragmatically influential ?

But to return to the individualistic aspect. I do not know why Blau reports the Rabbis as holding that the ' Shekinah is present when *two* are engaged with the Torah '. Wisdom is divine, and man's share in wisdom is divine too : God divides, imparts of his own wisdom to men who fear him (Ber. 58, part of which was quoted above). Hence we should expect the Rabbis to believe that when men are engaged in the pursuit of the highest wisdom, the Divine Glory is present. But why does Blau say *two* ? He quotes Aboth, iii. 3, where indeed Hananya b. Teradyon is on record in that sense. ' *Two* that sit together and are occupied in words of Torah, have the Shekinah among them, for it is said (Mal. iii. 16), They that feared the Lord spake often to one another, and the Lord hearkened and heard it.' These Rabbis had a firm addiction in favour of working with a comrade. ' Possess thyself of an associate ', said Joshua b. Perahya (Aboth, i. 7)—a president of the Sanhedrin, not the least arresting romance concerning him being that he was possibly a teacher of Jesus. Thus early in the chain of Jewish tradition was this truth understood, that companionship not only adds to the charm of study, but is an incalculable aid to its successful pursuit. The solitary student is a churl, without savour of wisdom.

But while all this is true, the student who is neither churl nor misanthrope may often be compelled to work alone, to have none to share the disappointments and the delights of the quest for truth. It may be his misfortune, not his fault, that he fails to find congenial friends. It is not always because he sports his oak that no familiar footstep treads his stairs. Why should such a one despair of the blessing of the Divine light? Why should Dr. Blau give us to understand that Rabbinic thought so disables and disqualifies him? Only when *two* are searching for wisdom is the Shekinah present? Look a little farther down the same chapter of the *Fathers* (Aboth, iii. 9) and you come across the saying of Meir's disciple, Ḥalafta of Cephar-Ḥananya. Let us read it in Dr. Taylor's version: 'R. Chalafta of Kaphar-Chananiah said, When *ten* sit and are occupied in words of Thorah the Shekinah is among them, for it is said (Ps. lxxxii. 1), God standeth in the congregation of the mighty [ten forming a congregation]. And whence is it proved of even *five*? Because it is said, He judgeth among gods [or judges: three judges and two litigants amounting to five]. And whence even *three*? Because it is said (Amos ix. 6) . . . and hath founded his troop in the earth. And whence even *two*? Because it is said (Mal. iii. 16): Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another. And whence even *one*? Because it is said (Exod. xx. 24): In all places where I record my name I will come unto *thee*, and I will bless *thee*.'

There are, it is true, variations in the MSS. with respect to some of these numbers, but there is no adequate critical reason for omitting the last clause. It is missing in some authorities, but is found in others (including the Cambridge Palestinian text and the Maḥzor Vitry),

and moreover we have a precisely similar saying elsewhere (in a baraitha) in the Talmud (Berakoth 6*a*). In the Talmud the clause is accepted without question.

We may conclude, then, that on the solitary student the Divine Glory might rest. To teachers the ascription is more picturesque. Round Abbahu (Midrash R. Canticles, i. 10), as he sat teaching, fire burned; possibly a storm was raging. He himself thought he was expounding wrongly. But another turn is given to the scene where Ben Azzai is concerned (Levit. R. xvi, § 4). He, too, sat and discoursed, and flame glowed. They said to him: 'Perhaps thou art occupied with the arrangements of the Chariot? Said he: No, but I am stringing (pearl-wise) words of Law to Prophets, and Prophets to Hagiographa, and the words of Law rejoice as when they were given on Sinai when the chief deliverance thereof was in fire' (Deut. iv. 11). Thus the occupation with the word of God reproduces the actual manifestation of the Glory when the Word was first revealed. And more profoundly, as Philo has it in the Fragment on Exod. xxiv. 17: 'And the appearance of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel.' 'The Glory of God is likened to fire,' comments Philo, 'not that it is so, but that it appeared so to cause amazement, an appearance as of flame, not a real flame. But as the flame consumes whatever material is opposed to it, so also when the true conception of God enters the soul, it destroys all impious falsities, and purifies and sanctifies the whole mind.' Is this purification more likely to occur in comradeship or in solitude? The answer is that the matter is temperamental. In conversation with his disciples, Jesus assures them (Matt. xviii. 20): 'Where

two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' The idea of mystic fellowship is here applied to a small group. The Christian mind could, as little as the Jewish, quite content itself with this, and we find the thought completed in the Logia printed, from the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, by Grenfell and Hunt : ' Where one is, there I also am ; and where two are, there will I also be.'

The Jewish antipathy to the monastic cell and its solitary occupant was sound enough, but it was excessive, and the mystics were needed to redress the balance. Two heads are better than one, runs the common proverb, borrowed perhaps from Ecclesiastes iv. 9 : ' Two are better than one, because they have a good reward for their labour.' This is applied by the expounder of Joshua b. Perahya (Aboth d. R. Nathan viii) to two students who room together, work together, and keep each other straight. The mystics thought otherwise ; they believed in solitude, *hithbodaduth*, as a means both of concentration of the human spirit and communion with the divine spirit. Not the confirmed mystics only, for the Gaon Elijah Wilna (who was only half a mystic) was of the same opinion. Jehuda Halevi, one of the staunchest foes of monastic asceticism (*Cuzari*, Part III, beginning), ends that series of dialogues with a passage (v. 23) which I ought to have quoted before, but which belongs equally here. In order to reconcile the group of passages which describe the Shekinah as having departed from the earth with the other group which treat the Shekinah as ever attainable by the human soul, he discriminates between the visible glory and the invisible. ' The visible Shekinah has, indeed, disappeared, because it does not reveal itself except to a prophet or a favoured community and in

a specially appointed place. This is what we hope for, when we read the text (Isa. lii. 8): "Eye to eye shall they see when the Lord returneth to Zion", and when we say in our prayers: "May our eyes behold Thy return unto Zion." But the invisible, spiritual Shekinah is with every born Israelite, and with every possessor of the true religion, pure in conduct, clean of heart, and with soul untainted in its relation to the God of Israel.' If we substitute 'human being' for 'born Israelite' and 'God's earth' for 'Zion'—we need not quarrel with this presentation of the case. We are not prepared to accept Disraeli's limitation, oft-repeated in *Tancred*, that God never speaks outside Asia or to a non-Asiatic. A remarkable aberration of genius indeed, though Jehuda Halevi errs in practically the same fashion.

For the full pragmatic utilization of the Glory of God we need both aspects of its incidence, the communal and personal aspects. The 'Keneset Israel'—the community—has a corporate duty, partly to justify God's choice of it, partly to show by its righteousness that the name of God is really called upon it. Then it must acknowledge its tribulations as just; there must be no calling of God to account. Here the communal and the personal aspects merge. Achan gave glory to God by his open confession, thus setting a precedent for all subsequent acknowledgement of the Divine dealings with man—the penitent criminal, the patient on the ordinary death-bed, the martyr at the stake, all alike 'justify God' by glorifying him in the hour of their passing (Yalquṭ on Joshua vii. 19; Sifre, ed. Friedmann, p. 133). Their act is at once personal and communal. Similarly with the administration of justice. The just man is a pillar of the Throne of Glory (Deut. R. v.); he makes

the Shekinah dwell among men (Sanh. 7*a*). The adulterer, whose crime is both individual and communal, weakens the power of the Shekinah (Tanh. Nasô). Liturgically, praise and prayer for God's Glory (as in the Lord's Prayer) precede petition, the general coming before the personal. The 'Son of Man' comes as a thief in the silent night, without observation, to the one faithful servant, yet he comes too in open and recognized glory amid hosannas—so the Gospels seem to combine the two aspects (Matt. xxiv. 46; Mark xi. 9). Scathing is the combination in the Talmud (Sanh. 11*a*). A heavenly voice in the upper chamber of Beth Goriah in Jericho announces: There is one here [Hillel] fit that the Shekinah should rest on him, but the generation is unworthy! Communal dishonour impedes the individual's attainment of glory. But on the individual side the ubiquity of the Shekinah makes the individual clean in secret as in public, for God is everywhere. As Bar Qappara said (Berakoth 63*a*), in exposition of Proverbs iii. 6: 'In all thy ways know Him, and He shall make plain thy paths.' And, as the whole earth is full of the Glory, the secret transgressor jars the feet of the Shekinah, just as the student who strides for four ells with erect and haughty carriage similarly treads on the heels of Glory (Berakoth 43*b*; Hagigah 16*a*). What some Jews ignorantly miscall the 'Ghetto bend' really derives from this reverential pose towards the near-by Glory. The modern Jew prides himself justly on his manly stature; he need not misinterpret his fathers' humbler pose.

The figure is grotesque, that of jolting the Shekinah's heels; but the sublime and the ridiculous rub shoulders ever. Theodolph of Orleans, imprisoned in his cloister

at Angers, wrote in 820 his famous hymn, and, the legend goes, sang it through the open window of his cell to King Louis as he passed in procession on a Palm Sunday. 'Gloria, laus, et honor' is a fine composition, skilfully woven out of psalmic and evangelic phrases. It still enjoys popularity in its English form, 'All glory, laud, and honour'. Yet it contains that instance of what Dr. Neale calls 'pious quaintness', which likens the worshipper to the 'little ass' on which the Messiah rode. Somehow it sounds less grotesque in Latin, 'tuus et nos simus asellus', yet it is grotesque enough. But then a prison is not the best place for writing hymns of glory. Chill penury may repress noble rage, and freeze the genial current of the soul. Not by waters of Babylon are Zion's songs best sung. More truly did the older Rabbis deny that the Glory of God can rest on man except in joy (Berakoth 31*a*). With all our modern hedonism, we are too given to the cult of the miserere. But the Glory of God exudes happiness. 'How happy I am in my Judaism', said Geiger's successor, P. F. Frankl, to C. G. Montefiore, in the latter's student years, when from Balliol and Jowett he betook himself for a while to the Berlin Lehranstalt and Steinthal. Hence, no doubt, Jews cannot reconcile themselves to the idea of a suffering God; he sympathizes and feels, but he does not suffer, he exults in his universe. The 104th Psalm rings true: 'The Glory of the Lord endureth for ever, the Lord rejoiceth in his works.' And man? 'I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live, I will praise him while I have my being.'

'What else can I do?' asks Epictetus. An oft-cited saying, but I cite it again. 'What else can I do, a lame old man, than sing hymns to God? If I were a nightin-

gale, I would do the nightingale's part; if I were a swan, I would do like a swan. But now I am a rational creature, and I ought to glorify God. This is my work. I do it, nor will I desert this post as long as I am allowed to keep it; and I exhort you to join in this same song.' *Ich kann nicht anders*—how this cry of determination echoes down the ages, it is the cry of the poet, the cry also of the martyr. Here joy conquers death. To make the supreme sacrifice for the glorification of God is man's supreme glory. The Glory of God, then, transfigures death. But it also dignifies life. Honesty, generosity, justice, amiability, chastity—all these human qualities are given a richer flavour, make a stronger appeal, when they are seen as acts of glorification. 'Thy glory is beautiful, I will beautify it', is Eleazar b. Hyrkanos' comment on Canticles iii. 14. Man is ennobled.

> He nothing common did or mean
> Upon that memorable scene—

Marvel's tribute to Charles I's demeanour sums up man's duty in life, in death. As the Stoic said: The sun does not wait for incantation to rise, so must man not wait for applause to do good. Duty is independent of the world's esteem, though the true servant strives to win that esteem for the Master's glory. But the esteem is consequence, not motive. 'Men revile me,' sings Jehuda Halevi; 'they know not that shame endured for Thy Glorious Name is naught but honour.' What is shame so borne when, 'as man honours Me I honour him', is our confident assurance (Num. R., ch. viii). How does man honour God? By honouring parent and teacher; by clean living; by service; above all by mercy. 'Thou, O God, forgivest, and this is Thy glory!'

cries a Synagogue liturgist. Man shows likest God when he acts up to this belief.

God created the world for His Glory. This is the essence of the idea—it runs through every phase of it, through God's Glory in Nature, in the Law, in every Revelation of the spirit, in the whole universe of men and of all things animate and inanimate. In the absolute sense, God is independent of the universe, and the Throne of Glory, like the Torah ('the world's glory', according to the reading of the Yalqut on Exod. xviii. 27), was (as we have seen) held to be pre-mundane. Yet the absolute God desired his Glory to be witnessed and glorified. He made the world that he might be called King, merciful, compassionate, long-suffering, and gracious. For, says the Zohar, the Bible of the Jewish mystics (Bô, p. 42*b*) : 'Had God not revealed himself in his attributes, how could he have governed the world with justice tempered by mercy? If he spread not his light over all creatures, how could they realize Him, and how could the text be fulfilled, *the whole world is full of His glory*?' Creation was thus necessary to make the Glory of God manifest. And God has faith in his world—finding it very good, and gaining new satisfaction whenever men justify his faith. 'O my world, my world, mayest thou ever please me as at this hour,' so Ḥama b. Ḥaninah (on Ps. xc. 1) makes God exclaim when he saw his world first complete, straight in its unsullied beauty from the Master artist's hand.

It is left to us to vindicate God's love for his world and his hope in us. We must be ever ready. There is no other time but here and now. This is the pragmatic climax. Joshua b. Qorḥa points out (Exod. R., ch. xlv, end), that at the burning bush, when God appeared to

Moses in the fire, he was at first curious, but when God proclaimed himself, ' Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God.' Later on, when he yearned to see the Glory, he was told, ' No man shall see me and live.' ' When I sought, thou soughtest not ; now that thou seekest, I seek not.' He who will not when he may, may not when he will. Man must not waste his opportunities. He must ever be ready to receive the vision, in a sense to deserve it by surrendering himself—when the vision is offered—' for Thy sake, O Lord, not for ours.' Honour God with thy very substance. There must be no reluctance of expenditure, no limitation of preparedness to give :

> Give all thou canst ; high heaven rejects the lore
> Of nicely calculated less or more.

So let man do his best. And if he perversely or ignorantly do his worst ? When the wicked in Gehinnom, hearing the mighty doxology of the saved in Heaven, answer Amen, they are admitted forthwith to the Father's presence (Yalquṭ on Isa. xxvi. 2). The Glory of God is victor over sin as over death ; it points the way to Paradise. There are no dead, said Tityl. There is no Hell, retorts the glorified Glory.

Printed in England at the Oxford University Press

Mac

1938
1941
1954

DATE DUE

ty of the
Library

41,610

BM 610 .A3 1925

Abrahams, Israel, 1858-1925

The glory of God

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BM610.A3 1925
Abrahams, Isr The glory of God :
3 0645 0002 8308 1